



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



47. 1304.



LECTURES
ON
UNITARIANISM,

MORE ESPECIALLY AS

TAUGHT BY MR. JOSEPH BARKER

AND HIS FOLLOWERS,

BEING

A SERIES OF DISCOURSES,

DELIVERED IN THE

PARISH CHURCH OF STOKE-UPON-TRENT,

BY THE

REV. S. MINTON, M.A.

Incumbent of Benkhill.

~~~~~



HANLEY:

PRINTED BY T. ALLDUT AND SON, MARKET-PLACE.

1847.



## CONTENTS.

---

| Lecture.                                                                                                     | Page. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| I.   Introductory .....                                                                                      | 9     |
| II.   On the Genuineness and Inspiration of Holy Scripture .....                                             | 19    |
| III.   On Human Reason .....                                                                                 | 39    |
| IV.   Heresy, Bigotry, and Charity .....                                                                     | 55    |
| V.    On Human Teaching .....                                                                                | 65    |
| VI.   On the Fallen Nature of Man .....                                                                      | 71    |
| VII.   The Trinity .....                                                                                     | 87    |
| VIII.   The Trinity (continued) .....                                                                        | 99    |
| IX.    The Foreknowledge of God ; especially in reference to the<br>Messiahship or Christhood of Jesus ..... | 111   |
| X.    The Miraculous Conception .....                                                                        | 119   |
| XI.   The Pre-existence of Christ .....                                                                      | 139   |
| XII.   The Deity of Christ .....                                                                             | 142   |
| XIII.   The Atonement .....                                                                                  | 191   |
| XIV.   Justification .....                                                                                   | 231   |
| XV.    Good and Evil Spirits .....                                                                           | 263   |
| XVI.   The Sabbath .....                                                                                     | 275   |
| Conclusion .....                                                                                             | 299   |
| Appendix, containing Extracts from Mr. Barker's Lectures on the<br>Prayer Book .....                         | 303   |



## PREFACE.

---

THE writer of the following lectures takes this opportunity of stating his reasons for declining the calls which have been made upon him, to hold a discussion with Mr. Barker, the founder and leading advocate of that sect of Unitarians, called in this neighbourhood, "The Christian Brethren."\* It is his decided conviction, that

\* Some persons might think it would have been better, if the argument had been kept more general, and less allusion been made to the above named individual; but the peculiar circumstances of the case absolutely required it, as it is the mischief done in this particular locality by his tracts, &c. which these lectures are solely intended to counteract; and he bearing the same relation to the sect who distribute them, that Goliath did to the Philistines. The Philistines would no doubt have strongly objected to being called Goliathites, but David knew what he was about; and his personal allusion to their champion put them all to flight. Some statements in the introductory lecture will shew how little such a result is anticipated in the present instance; and the observation is only made for the information of any Unitarian at a distance, who might repudiate some of the opinions here combated, or of other persons, who might be surprised at the style of argument frequently adopted.

In a pamphlet just published, entitled "Peter an Unitarian," it is encouraging to observe how completely Mr. Barker is thrown overboard. The writer evidently has himself, and wishes to shew that Unitarians generally have, great reverence for the Bible: he therefore does not attempt to defend the extracts produced from Mr. Barker's works, but blames me for not having stated at first that the Unitarianism combated in these lectures was the Unitarianism of Mr. Barker and his followers. To which it need only be replied, that it *was*, in the first lecture, stated to be "the Unitarianism prevalent in this neighbourhood," an expression, which I am sure there were not six persons in the church who did not distinctly understand. The writer however suggests, that "finding how impregnable is the Unitarianism of Channing and Carpenter, he has since thought it wise to adopt another course;" a pretty clear confession that Mr. Barker's Unitarianism is *not* impregnable. Of Carpenter's works I never read a page, and very little more of Channing's; almost the only passage of his that I remember, is his statement about the ground of our love to Christ.—"There is but one ground for virtuous affection in the universe, and that is—moral

public discussions on religious matters, whatever be the parties engaged, *generally* do more harm than good. The tactics employed, and the scenes that occur,\* are neither conducive to the spirit of truth nor to the spirit of love. It is not the best cause that gains the victory, but the best arguer. Besides, a plausible cavil may be raised against some truth in half a minute, which it would take half an hour satisfactorily to answer; and if a number of them be strung together, and the time allowed for reply be limited, it becomes morally impossible to expose the fallacy of them all; and the opponent has only, at the commencement of his next speech, just to run over them again; and say "he is glad to find his arguments were considered conclusive, as no reply to them was even attempted." A spoonful of arsenic may be thrown over a plate of meat in a moment; but it's not a moment's work to pick each particle of it out, and leave the meat pure and wholesome. For these general reasons, independently of personal considerations, the author, unless he should see cause to change his opinion, could never be induced to engage in a *vivâ voce* discussion with any one.

As our Saviour's example is urged, a few words may be required in answer. When any one came to him in an humble, teachable spirit, really to gain instruction, he always received them willingly, and taught them: but did he always answer the cavillings and questionings of those who, he knew, came only to oppose him? Did he consent

goodness:" and a little afterwards, speaking of the gratitude and love which true believers feel towards Jesus for having saved them from everlasting death, he says, it is quite natural, but "of very little worth." This is quite enough for any spiritually minded Christian; he would not want to read much farther."

\* The following extracts from the report of the discussion between the Rev. W. Cooke and Mr. Joseph Barker are quite sufficient for him at least, whatever may be the opinion of others. "Dr. Lees—'I rise to order.' (Loud hissing, applause, and cries of 'Down, down,') 'The umpire has decided'—('Sit down,' 'Stand up,' and general confusion.) Again, (Loud cheers, hissing, hooting, and great excitement.) These manifestations of feeling were displayed again and again; and the entire scene, as looked upon and listened to from the platform was one not often witnessed—(Loud laughter. 'You'd better hold your tongue,' 'Put him out.') &c.



to enter into controversy with such persons? The very reverse. We almost invariably find, that when any persons came merely to catch him in his talk, or puzzle him with a difficulty, he either evaded the question, or refused to answer it altogether, or confounded them with some home thrust to their own consciences. Another thing to be observed is, that when his disciples, that is, those who were willing to learn from him, could not understand anything in his public teaching, they went afterwards *privately* to ask him. This example, no doubt, any Christian minister, as far as God enables him, would at all times be glad to follow.

But did not St. Paul, it is asked, argue publicly, when he preached in heathen cities? He did: but besides the fact of his being able to work miracles in proof of his doctrines, we must remember that he had no other way of preaching at all. If the laws of the country had afforded him a place where he could deliver his message, uninterrupted by the laughter of the Athenians, or the wild uproar of the Ephesians, no doubt he would have preferred it; and if ever the clergy should be deprived of their churches, where at present, thank God, they can preach his word, undisturbed by the gainsaying or mockery of opposers, they will then, you may rely upon it, fulfil their commission where and how they can. Their general reluctance to engage in public debate being so perseveringly paraded as a proof of conscious weakness, and the boasting challenges, which the knowledge of that reluctance gives birth to, having so much weight with ignorant minds, the subject appeared to require notice, and the above remarks will, it is hoped, show something of the real state of the case.

An important fact to be remembered in controversy is, that there is no such thing in the world as an *unanswerable* argument on any side of any question whatever,

religious or otherwise. An argument may be perfectly satisfactory and convincing to one who is willing to be convinced; but,

“He that’s convinced against his will,  
Is of the same opinion still;”

and bring forward arguments ever so many or ever so powerful, he is sure to find *some answer* to them; generally such a plausible one as to satisfy himself, and often to shake others, who are not able to see deeply into a subject. Unitarians make great boast of their being able to *answer* all the arguments that are brought against them. No doubt they can; so can the Atheist, the Deist, or Romanist. You cannot bring a single argument against either of the three, but what, if he is clever enough and determined not to give way, he will be able *to get out of*—and yet they can’t all be in the right. The Christian should be aware of this, or else he is apt to be staggered and perplexed, when he finds very clever ingenious answers given to what had always appeared to him, and are in reality, conclusive proofs. Let him seek the Spirit’s guidance, and he will assuredly be taught what is the mind of God in scripture; being satisfied of this, he cares not what other meaning may be put upon the words; he sees clearly what God *did* mean when he inspired the men to write them, and therefore he doesn’t trouble himself to find out what they *can* mean. As far as everything necessary for him is concerned, “he has an unction from the Holy One, and knows all things.”

A few expressions in the following Lecture may sound harsh and uncharitable, to the ears of some, who read them. The writer would beg such to suspend their judgment until they have read the Lecture on Latitudinarianism in Doctrine, when the subjects of bigotry and charity will be fully discussed. Meanwhile he would only say, that, as far as his own disposition is concerned, he should

be naturally much more tempted to be unfaithful, from fear of causing any one pain, than to be unnecessarily severe in his language; and he is quite sure, it will be more painful to him to utter many things, which faithfulness to God, and faithfulness to souls compel him to utter, than it will be to any who hear them. What can be more distressing than to meet a man, virtuous, amiable, adorned with every outward quality to make one love and admire him,—and then to find that he is an unbeliever! How delightful, if one *could* think, that all such were journeying by different roads to the same heavenly home! One is almost tempted to envy an Unitarian the luxury of his doctrine of sincerity; but God's word forbids it, and we dare neither indulge ourselves with unscriptural hopes, nor cruelly flatter others, by saying "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."



## LECTURE I.

---

"And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty.

"Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."—REV. xvi. 13—15.

No intelligent student of prophecy can doubt, that we are just approaching the last crisis of the present dispensation. There are many differences of opinion, more or less important, with regard to the particular events, which may be expected shortly to take place; but all who know anything of prophecy are agreed, that these are the last days, and that a fearful tempest of physical and moral evil is ready to burst upon us, preparatory to the new millennial kingdom, which will quickly follow. In the book of Revelation especially we can distinctly trace the main outlines of the history both of the church and of the world from the time of the apostles to the present hour; our position being evidently under the sixth vial, the very period, when the great outbreak of evil mentioned in our text takes place. Time will not permit us to enter into a critical examination of the figurative terms made use of; suffice it to say, the three spirits are, 1st, Infidelity; 2ndly, Social and Political disorganization; 3rdly, Popery. These are represented as issuing forth, under the direction of the Prince of darkness, to lash the world into a phrenzy of guilt and folly, to prepare the materials for one last convulsive struggle—a struggle which will be brought to a close in a way little expected, and by one little thought of: for it is when the storm is at its loudest, and the darkness at its thickest, that the Sun of Righteousness

will burst through the clouds; it is at the hour of Satan's highest triumph, and the Church's deepest distress, when the three spirits have accomplished their work, and are raising the shout of victory, that He appears, who announces his advent in the few, but emphatic words "Behold, I come as a thief." And then what a change! It is a tempting subject to dwell on, but we must forbear; a few years at the most of watchful patience, and we shall know it, no longer by faith, but by sight. Already do we see the gathering hosts assembling themselves together for the battle of the great day of God Almighty. The three spirits are all actively at work around us; it is difficult to say, which most actively. If we turn to Popery, we see her rousing herself from her slumber, filling our land with Jesuit missionaries, disguised and undisguised, corrupting our church, undermining our glorious constitution, and seducing many a deluded victim within the fated walls of Babylon. If we turn to social and political affairs, do we not see exactly what St. Paul described eighteen hundred years ago, when he said, "This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come; for men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, *heady, high-minded*, lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God, having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." Do we not also see, *aye* and feel, what Jesus mentioned as the signs of his coming, "Distress of nations with perplexity, men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth." And if we turn to Infidelity, do we not see it in all its varied forms, marching onward with rapid strides, not only on the continent, but even in the very fortress of true religion, England itself? Universal scepticism seems the spirit of the age: every body is asking like Pilate, "What is truth?" Even those who have not gone the full length of rejecting the truth, seem in doubt about it, some about one part some about another, and some about all. This is just as Jesus said it should be,— "When the Son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?" No—"Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived."

It would be impossible for us even to glance at the various denominations of Infidelity which the present age teems with. Suffice it to say, the fatal ingredient in them all, the single principle, on which they are all agreed, is rejecting the only way of salvation which God has offered

to perishing sinners—the atoning blood of a crucified Saviour. Any system which does this, whatever else it may believe or not believe, is to all intents and purposes **fidelity**. God has offered us pardon and salvation in **one particular way**: the man who accepts that offer is a believer and is saved; the man who refuses it, whether from indifference, from love of sin, or from fancying that God will accept him in some other way, is an unbeliever and is lost. Our Lord's own words are, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned." It is true the nearer that error approaches truth, the less it shocks the mind, and therefore the more dangerous it is. The Unitarian refuses Christ as his Saviour, no less than the Deist; but then he adopts a system which professes to be the gospel of Christ, and in some points bears so close a resemblance to it, that the unwary and unstable are the more easily entangled. Deism or Atheism is palpable poison presented to you openly: Unitarianism is poison mixed up in your food; so that while you think you are taking the wholesome nourishment that God has provided for you, you are really receiving what will kill the soul. A vast difference indeed is there between the man who mixes it, and the man who is deceived into swallowing it; but in either case death must follow, for God has said it, and he cannot, will not change.

When speaking however of Unitarianism as a system, it must not be supposed that all who hold that name, are alike in their faith: it is their boast that they have no creeds, that they do not check the spirit of free inquiry, that every one must think for himself; nay, one of their ablest champions, Mr. Martineau, tells us flatly, that we must not expect to find Unitarianism the same for any length of time together; that Unitarians themselves must not pretend that they have got the truth, for that truth is ever advancing, and fresh light being gained; so that the Unitarians of the next generation may be as much in advance of the Unitarians of this generation, as they are now in advance of Trinitarians. You shall hear his own words—"But independently of these actual differences, can it be expected, that our present forms of opinion will continue uniform and permanent? Is it consistent with experience to suppose that a church, however wise, and however confident its members, is to be exempt from the laws of intellectual and social change?" What a confession that Unitarianism is a human system! The truth of God is not touched by intellectual and social changes:—'Jesus Christ the same, to-day, and for ever.' "Some

preceding speaker has professed his undoubted belief, that our existing Unitarianism is destined to be the world's eternal and universal faith. Happy and complacent belief! held, and disappointed by every sect in turn with respect to its own creed, yet living and fervent still! needful perhaps to maintain the zeal of successive generations, yet surely maintaining it on delusion! Among ourselves, little has been done since the time of Priestly; yet it cannot be supposed that we are always to live on the discoveries and glories of the past. I too doubt not that our present Unitarianism, or *something far better*, will be the ultimate faith of men; but I conceive we are obviously in a state of transition; that every mark which history affords of such a state is to be found among us; in one direction a great ferment of new ideas; in another, a determined stand upon old ones, and every where a consciousness of religious defect, exciting earnest, but vague, aspirations after improvement. Why then should we not confess that we are on our way to better things, instead of attempting to consolidate our present modes of thought? Why drop our anchor here, in seas from which we must be driven, instead of looking out for bright lands ahead, and seeking still a better country, even a heavenly.\* So also the celebrated Dr. Priestly tells us, "that he became first a high Arian, next a low Arian, then a Socinian, then the lowest kind of Unitarian," and he ends by saying "that he does not know when his creed will be fixed."

And no wonder such men, with all their talent and learning, should not know what they will believe next; for having set up their own reason against the word of God, it is impossible to say where it will lead them. When the vessel has once broken away from her anchor, she will be driven and tossed about by every wind and tide: no one can say which rock or quicksand she will split upon; and the only thing certain about her is, that unless rescued by an almighty hand she will founder. What need is there to repeat the Apostle's exhortation? "Be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." "Take unto you the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand in the evil day, and having done all to stand."

\* "It can scarcely be needful to remark, that Mr. Martineau refers, not to their being driven back into the haven of safety, but to their being driven out still further on the trackless ocean of infidelity.



Another remarkable fact, which the above extract reminds us of, is the wonderful unanimity with which infidels of all kinds and classes are eagerly looking forward to some glorious crash about to take place. Mr. Martineau does not tell us, nor indeed seem to know, the exact nature of the change he is expecting; I can scarcely conceive of any thing "*far better*" than his opinions, except Atheism or Pantheism; and it is certainly worthy of notice, that in the very same speech he says, "I cordially subscribe to a sentiment of deep, perhaps unsuspected meaning, in the sermon preached before the Association, on Wednesday, viz:—that our Trinitarian brethren, in their devotions, bow, like ourselves, before the mental image of an infinite perfection. If so, and if the real object of every man's worship be the conception of Deity in his own mind," &c. &c. When a man has reached that point, it would be a very easy "transition" to pass into the German Pantheism, which asserts, that the Divinity resides in every man, and that man is the only God. This religion, if so it may be called, is spreading most fearfully on the continent; and one of its great champions declares, that "it only wants the signal to explode, and then will be performed in Europe a drama, compared with which, the French Revolution was but an innocent trifle." The same tone of triumph, though not combined with the same doctrinal views, pervades the whole of Mr. Joseph Barker's writings. "Who can prove," he asks, "that the fire is not already kindled, which will consume all the rubbish of theology?" It is not the first time that Caiaphas has prophesied right. Positively, these men know what is coming better than many Christians; *they* see the signs of the times plainly enough; would that the Church might open her eyes and see them too!

And what is the duty of Christian ministers in these days of rebuke and blasphemy? Surely it is, more than ever, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. Religious controversy is a thing so painful to every rightly constituted mind, that few persons would enter on it, without a stern necessity. Besides the danger of diverting our attention from the spirit to the letter, and of exciting, either in ourselves or others, feelings of anger, rivalry, or strife, it obliges us to study the bible in an argumentative way; which is not by any means the most edifying or profitable. We have to search the scriptures, not for guidance, support, and comfort, but for proofs of this, or disproofs of that; for answers to all sorts of cavils, and disputes, and objections: not that the Chris-

tian cannot do both, but he would be glad to avoid the necessity; he would rather feed upon Christ than argue about him. Happy is the man whose heart is established in the truth, and who can keep clear of the dust and din of controversy; who can feed in green pastures, and drink of the fountain of living waters, undisturbed by the wranglings and disputings, which agitate the minds of others; believing in Jesus, and having the witness in himself. Thank God, the time is not far off, when all Christ's people will have this enjoyment to perfection. When Jesus comes, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is. We shall see even as we are seen, and know even as we are known. Then all harrassing doubts will vanish, and all perplexing difficulties be removed. Then all arguments will be ended, and all controversies will be hushed; no difference of opinion will interrupt our harmony—no jealousy, distrust, or suspicion damp our mutual love—not a jarring note will be heard in the songs of the redeemed.

But however animating and refreshing it may be to look forward to such a time, we must remember, and we can't easily forget it, that we are yet in the field of battle; the fight must be fought, ere the victors can sit down at the marriage supper of the Lamb. It is a remark of a living writer, that in times like these, truth can only be maintained at the edge of the spiritual bayonet. A strong conviction of the truth of that remark has led me to commence these lectures. And here let me say a word or two as to what I do, and what I do not, hope for from them. In the first place, I do not hope to do away with Unitarianism; being fully convinced that either Unitarianism, or as Mr. Martineau says "something far better," will continue and increase, till the Lord of Glory comes himself to settle the question. Nor do I expect to convince any who are determined not to be convinced; who have already determined what they *will* believe, and what they will not believe, and are ready to make every thing bend to that determination. Still nothing is impossible with God; his grace can reach any heart, and he may use what instrument he pleases. St. Paul tells us "in meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves, if God peradventure will *give* them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth; and that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are led captive by him at his will." Therefore, though we well know that arguing with those who are resolved not to believe, is humanly speaking like talking to the air, yet looking above human means to the

power of God, let us pray that this effort may not be lost on all even of such; but that God may indeed give some of them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth.

Those however for whose benefit more especially these lectures are intended, and to whom we have more lively hopes of their being useful, are such of God's Children as he has permitted for his own wise ends to fall partially into this snare, or at least to be distressed with grievous doubts as to the vital truths of Christianity. "My sheep," says Jesus, "hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me, and I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish, neither shall any man pluck them out of my hands. My Father which gave them me is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." They may wander from Jesus for a season, they may be caught in traps, and drop into pit falls, but the good Shepherd will seek them out and bring them back again, and ever afterwards they will be more distrustful of themselves, and walk more humbly with their God. If there are any such here, oh, pray to God to remove the veil from your eyes, and to shine upon his own word, that you may see in it the unsearchable riches of Christ. Ask him to send his Spirit into your heart to guide you into all truth, to preserve you from all error, and to set your feet on the rock. Beseech him "that he would grant you according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his spirit in the inner man, that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that being rooted and grounded in love, you may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the length, and breadth, and depth, and height, and to know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God."

There is yet another class of persons, who we hope may derive benefit; namely, those who *do* know the truth, who believe it and love it, but yet are not able to give an answer to every one that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them. They are not aware of the strength of their own position, and consequently are always liable to be staggered by some specious objection, or clever sophistry being brought against them. They have perhaps not had time or opportunity to study the scriptures so closely, as to be armed at every point: it is true, they have the shield of faith, and that will certainly quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one; but St. Peter tells us to add to our faith knowledge; and St. Paul bids us take "the *whole* armour of God." Now I hope by God's help to bring

such a mass of scriptural evidence before you, as will leave no doubt in the mind of any humble and sincere inquirer, as to the vital truths of Christianity, and enable the believer to stand unmoved against any assaults, however powerful, that may be made upon his faith.

Let it not however be thought that I have forgotten the solemn words, "No man can say that Jesus is the Christ, but by the Holy Ghost." No, I feel the force of them intensely. No one can study the Unitarian controversy without feeling it. Such apparently powerful arguments, such staggering objections, such plausible theories, and all put together in the most attractive form, and with such consummate address, that it would be almost impossible for any one, unless he was either spiritually enlightened by the Holy Ghost, or thoroughly acquainted with the scriptural evidence on the other side to stand against it. And considering how very many nominal Christians are neither one nor the other, the only wonder is that more are not caught in the snare. A man may say with his lips that Jesus is the Christ, without being at all taught by the Spirit; but no man can receive Jesus into his heart as the Christ, that is, as his anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, but by the converting enlightening grace of the Holy Ghost. Paul may plant and Apollos water, but God alone can give the increase. What may be the effect of these lectures, depends simply upon the blessing of God. I know not whether souls may be saved, believers be established, or unbelievers be hardened; perhaps all three: but this I know, that in not one single instance does God's word ever "return unto him void," but must "accomplish the thing whereunto it is sent;" that it is "unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved, and in them that perish;" to the one it is a "savour of death unto death," to the other a "savour of life unto life." Let us all then plead earnestly before the throne of grace, that the seed which will be sown may bring forth fruit a hundred fold, to the praise and glory of God.

It is very probable that Unitarian tracts will be distributed among you, and Unitarian lectures delivered, on these occasions; and you may ask whether you should read the tracts, and hear the lectures. Now of course those who disbelieve, or who doubt, the catholic faith, will do so, whatever I may say. It can only be those who know the truth, and perhaps not all of them, that would be willing to follow a minister's advice on the subject. But to such I would answer the question in the words of a wiser man than any here, and an inspired man as well,

"Cease my son from hearing the instruction which causeth to err from the words of knowledge." And a greater than Solomon says, "Take heed *what ye hear*." In obedience to which St. Paul exhorts Timothy "to withdraw himself from such as taught otherwise." I know how easy it will be to call this bigotry, even though I have used the words of Solomon, Paul, and Christ himself; I know how easy it will be to say in triumph, it must be a weak cause that won't bear to hear both sides; and if this was a law suit between Unitarians and Trinitarians, and you were the jury, then no doubt it would be wrong to decide without hearing both parties; but as it is a matter that concerns the salvation of your own souls, and nothing else, I dare not but follow the example of every prophet and apostle in the Bible, who invariably warned his hearers against even listening to false teachers. Let me therefore solemnly advise you, before God, as you value your peace of mind, and the salvation of your soul, not to read a line of any such publication, that may be given you, and to take care that no one else does, by putting it behind the fire.\* A little tract that is read in five minutes, may plant a thorn in your heart that may rankle there long; and you have no one but yourself to blame for the injury and pain you suffer from it. When you know the truth, it is tempting God to tamper with error. If you don't want to fall, keep off the ice; if you would not cut yourself, don't play with edged tools; if you would escape the fever, beware of infection. If you have such confidence in the strength of your own constitution, that you think you can take any quantity of poison without being hurt by it, depend upon it, you'll get a dose some day, that will be too strong for you. God will make you feel your own weakness, and the sinfulness of such vain confidence, perhaps by a severe and long fall. Ah! how many instances of this are here before me! How many are there here, who once would have shuddered at the thought of

\* As this advice seems to have given such offence, I must take the opportunity of stating, that after an interval of two months, I am still perfectly satisfied that it was *Scriptural* and therefore *proper* advice; and further, that having read it before it was printed to a party of eight or ten clergymen, they every one expressed their unqualified assent to it. I certainly should not have recommended the course that was adopted, namely, tearing them up on the spot, because it might look like an intentional insult; but if it was wrong for a man to read them himself, (which I clearly showed) it must of course have been wrong for him to let any one else do so; and the only certain way of preventing this was either to burn or in some way to destroy them. I need not say that this refers only to *given*, not to lent, tracts; such should be immediately returned. (*See p. 53.*)

denying the Deity of their Saviour, or rejecting his atonement, but were not afraid to hear and read what they knew to be false; they were not afraid to parley with the tempter, they must hear what he had to say, and know both sides; and God let them have their own way, and left them to him: so that while they were amusing themselves with examining the net, it was being unconsciously fastened on them, till they were bound hand and foot, "unable to deliver their souls, or to say, Is there not a lie in my right hand?" Do they not cry out to us as with a voice of thunder, "*Take heed what ye hear.*" Dear brethren, listen to the warning. Keep clear yourselves, and implore the Holy Spirit for them, to make his own word sharper than any two-edged sword, to cut the net in pieces, that they may be able to say with gratitude and joy, "The snare is broken, and we are escaped."

## LECTURE II.

### ON THE GENUINENESS AND INSPIRATION OF HOLY SCRIPTURE.\*

"For I testify unto every man, that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things that are written in this book."—Rev. xxii. 18, 19.

STARTLING words these to people who call this book "a forgery," a "bundle of riddles," and speak of "the *so called* book of Revelations!" Rather a stern and uncompromising answer to the question we are so often taunted with—Do you think a man cannot be a Christian who does not believe in the book of Revelations? Surely a man should weigh well the claims to authority of a book, which ends with such a sentence as this, before he rejects it! And how thankful ought we to be, that the evidence in its favour is so perfectly overwhelming, that if he does weigh it with any thing approaching to honesty, *he cannot doubt*. For besides the general evidence there is for it equally with the other books of the Bible, we have further decisive proof in the historical fulfilment of its prophecies. Whatever differences there may be amongst the learned about the interpretation of it, the main outlines of the history both of the Church and the world, for the last 1800 years, are seen there so strikingly and indisputably, that "he who runs may

\* Some persons may not be aware that in the original language of the Bible, Hebrew and Greek, no stops are used; they are a great help to us, but are not, strictly speaking, part of the Bible, and of course of no inspired authority. Neither, we may add, are the divisions into chapters and verses, the headings of the chapters and pages, or the marginal references.

read." The authority of the whole book might very safely be staked upon the fulfilment of the 9th chapter alone, in the history of the Saracens and Turks: if any one can read Mr. Elliot's explanation of that chapter, in his great work on the Revelations, and have a shadow of a doubt on the inspiration of the book, it would be utterly hopeless to attempt to convince him of any thing. But what is all this, it may be asked, to a poor illiterate person, who can't get at such books, and is totally ignorant of history? This is a question that applies to many other cases, besides the one immediately before us, and will be considered more fully in a future lecture on the Christian ministry. "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers."—1 Cor. xii. 28. If therefore you will not condescend to make use of *God's ordinance*, but are resolved to be your own teachers, any mistake you may fall into through ignorance, must of course come under the condemnation of what St. Peter calls "willing ignorance." You all have opportunities of applying to some Christian minister or other, who will no doubt be glad at any time to show you the proofs of the genuineness and inspiration of this, as well as the other books of Holy Scripture: so that, if at the day of judgment, you should be found to have rejected any part of God's word, from not knowing the evidence for it, you will be utterly without excuse, *because you might have known it*. To set up your own judgment against that of the whole Church, without even knowing the grounds on which the Church decided, certainly displays a spirit, the very reverse of that, to which God's direction is promised—"The meek will be guide in judgment." Ps. xxv. 9.

And this leads us to the question, whether the awful words of our text apply only to this book, or to the whole Bible. Now every one must allow that, strictly speaking they belong primarily and in an especial manner to the Revelations alone, nor can their application be *proved* to any thing else. But for myself, considering their peculiar position, at the close of the last of the inspired books, not one of which has such a warning attached to it, (while there appears no reason why the rejection of this book should incur greater guilt than the rejection of any other,—especially before the fulfilment had thrown such an additional weight of evidence in its favour,) I cannot doubt for a moment, that this solemn declaration was dictated by the Spirit to St. John, for the express purpose of showing, that the volume of inspiration, which had been gradually filling up and receiving one addition after another for 1500 years, was now closed, and teaching us to guard the sacred treasure with holy awe, that it might be handed down pure and entire from generation to generation. Here a difficulty



may be raised, with regard to the many doubtful passages, and various readings in our Bibles, concerning which the best scholars have always been so divided in opinion. It may be argued, that if a certain passage be genuine, those who reject it must be guilty of taking from the word of God; if it be not genuine, those who receive it must be equally guilty of adding to the word of God. This depends upon circumstances: partly upon the degree of evidence there is for or against the particular text, and partly upon the spirit in which the individual has examined that evidence, and whether he has used all the opportunities that may have been within his reach for coming to a just decision. But whatever doubtful points may arise, there are some which will admit of no doubt; as for instance, when a number of persons with little or no learning, in the teeth of every manuscript and version in the world, and supported only by the groundless assertions and ingenious cavillings of some daring adversary, reject whole books, as the Song of Solomon and the Revelations, merely because they cannot understand them; or whole chapters, as the two first of Matthew and Luke, because what is related in them won't suit their theory. Such persons may contrive to persuade themselves that these are no part of the original Scriptures; but if such wilful ignorance affords them any excuse at the day of judgment for taking from God's word, then assuredly will the Church of Rome be held guiltless for all "the blood of the saints" with which scripture pronounces her "drunken," because, as Jesus foretold, they *thought* they were thereby doing God service. John xvi. 2.

With regard to the genuineness and inspiration of scripture, the differences amongst Unitarians are endless; but not one of them that ever I met with or heard of, certainly none of their great writers or leading men, acknowledge the full inspiration of the whole Bible. And it is important to observe, that though they so differ, one receiving this part and one that part of scripture, one placing this degree and one that degree of confidence in it, yet they all treat it on exactly the same principle,—the very principle on which the avowed Deist treats it. They both admit just as much of the Bible, and yield it as much authority, as they can make agree with their own opinions. The Unitarian thinks he can make a great portion of scripture interpreted with a certain degree of freedom, meet his own views, and therefore he receives it: the Deist sees that none of it will agree with *his* view, and therefore he rejects it all. The principle is exactly the same. Each of them say practically, We will admit just as much as we can understand, or as we choose to believe, and nothing more. Consequently the lower a Unitarian descends in the scale, that is, the nearer

he approaches the Deist, the more of scripture he rejects, and the greater irreverence he treats it with. The celebrated Unitarian Belsham declared, that the only difference between French Deism and the gospel of Christ, was the fact of the resurrection of a human being; and that any part of the Bible which taught any thing else, was either an interpolation, omission, false reading, mistranslation, or erroneous interpretation. So you may imagine what *he* brought the Bible to; the only thing it taught, beyond the simple morality of a virtuous infidel, was the resurrection of a human being. Another, Dr. Priestly, says that the sacred writers give "lame accounts, improper quotations, and inconclusive reasonings." Another, Steinhart, tells us, that the "accounts in the New Testament, whether true or false, are only suited for ignorant uncultivated minds, who cannot enter into the evidence of natural religion." Another, Semler, on St. Peter's declaration that "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," says, that he here speaks according to the conceptions of the Jews, and that the prophets may have delivered the offspring of their own brains as Divine revelations." Another, Engeden, says that St. John's part of the New Testament is written "with concise and abrupt obscurity, inconsistent with itself, and made up of allegories." Another, Gagneius, glories in having given a "little light to St. Paul's darkness, a darkness as some thing studiously affected." Another, Evanson, says, "The gospel histories contain gross and irreconcilable contradictions." Mr. Martineau, whom I have already quoted, says, "that there is no likeness whatever between the God of Abraham and the God of Jesus Christ." And Mr. Joseph Barker, speaking of the difference between the Old and New Testaments, calls the Bible "a two-mouthed guide, and double-tongued director."\* These few extracts show how useless it would be to attempt examining any particular doctrine, until we have settled the ground on which we are to stand. And this is always the first thing to be done in controverting any heresy from Popery downwards. You will almost invariably find, that false teach-

\* When these words were quoted in a public discussion by the Rev. W. Cooke, Mr. Barker in his reply read about half a page of the work in which they occur, and then added, "Now, if after this partial quotation, and wicked misrepresentation of my meaning, you can ever trust a man that shall pretend to give an account of my sentiments from my books, without looking at them for yourselves, you will deserve to be deceived." Why the whole passage is a laboured attempt to prove that the Bible *is*, what it is there called in as many words, "a two mouthed guide, and double-tongued director; and that without a single saving clause! This is certainly one of the boldest controversial manœuvres I ever met with. Is it possible any audience could be entrapped by it? And yet the Reporter's note is—(Loud applause.) No wonder people are not very eager to accept Mr. Barker's challenges. It may be a want of moral courage, but I for one should certainly dread his *powers*!

ers and heretics of all kinds endeavour to shake your confidence either in the *purity*, the *completeness*, or the *authority* of God's word: and these, especially the latter, (which comes under the head of Inspiration) we shall now proceed to examine.

To begin with the New Testament.—We have historical proof from heathen as well as Christian writers, that about eighteen hundred years ago a set of men issued forth from Judea to preach a new religion, which rapidly spread and received the name of Christianity. Before we can examine into the truth of that religion, we must first know what it is. This the New Testament professes to teach us. It comes to us as written by the very men, who first preached Christianity throughout the world. The question is, how are we to know, that it *was* written by them? We answer, Just in the same way we know that any ancient work was written by the person whose name it bears—by a continued chain of evidence from that time to our own. How do you know that John Bunyan wrote the *Pilgrim's Progress*, or that Napoleon was beaten at the battle of Waterloo? Because every body says so, and always has said so; and there's a degree of general consent, that puts a thing beyond all reasonable doubt. Of course it would be quite impossible here to bring forward the evidence for the authenticity of each book in the New Testament; nor is it necessary, as Unitarians in general admit them. There are plenty of books, in which any doubter may find the proofs fully and satisfactorily given; especially Horne's *Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures*, and Paley's *Evidences of Christianity*. The particular objections, which are raised against the two first chapters of Matthew and Luke, will be considered, when we come to the subject of the Incarnation of the Son of God. The book of Revelations has been spoken of already. If any other parts are objected to, we must refer you to the works just mentioned, or others of a similar kind. One great means however of shaking people's confidence in the Bible we must not omit to mention; and that is, by persuading them, that the text of Scripture was so altered and corrupted in copying one manuscript from another before printing was invented, and the meaning of it so falsified by mistranslation, that it is impossible now to tell *what* the Apostles wrote, and that our authorised version is quite an unsafe guide. No doubt there are many various readings, and it is often difficult to say which is the true one; no doubt there are some passages, the translation of which might be improved, especially by the removal of some obsolete words; but there is not a single important doctrine of the Gospel, that cannot be proved from texts of Scripture, *about which there is*

*no dispute, and which are correctly translated in our version.* With regard to the various readings, instead of the dishonesty and carelessness, with which the early copyists are charged, it is perfectly notorious, that the greatest possible pains were taken to keep the text pure, and every copy subjected to the most scrupulous and rigid investigation. And how thankful should we be to the watchful providence of God, which has preserved his word to us after this length of time in such purity, that Dr. Kennicot, after thirty years devoted to the examination of Hebrew manuscripts, "expressed something like regret that his labour was lost, because he *found out no important variations after all his researches.* But a pious friend, who heard him, consoled him by saying, Doctor, your labour is not lost; for it results in this great fact, that your labour has tended to show the preservation and the incorruptness of the volume, on which our hopes are placed." Nor ought we to be less thankful for the admirable translation of the Bible we possess in our authorised version; which, although about three centuries old, stands yet unrivalled. Of Dr. Conquest's mischievous attempt to supplant it, the most complimentary thing that can be said is, that it is vastly inferior to it: and with regard to the "Improved Version of the New Testament," published some years back by the British and Foreign Unitarian Society, it is stated by Dr. Byrth, Rector of Wallasy, that at a time when he was leaning to Unitarianism, a perusal of that work completely rescued him, by shewing him what gross perversions of Scripture were necessary, in order to maintain the Unitarian theory. The conclusion therefore we come to is this; that an unlearned person, who has no opportunity of turning to the original languages or consulting critical works, may buy a common English Bible for the sum of tenpence, and feel confident that he possesses what is practically the pure unadulterated word of God; which will teach him no error, but by the Spirit's blessing guide him into all saving truth. Here however you'll say I'm anticipating; and so I am. We have as yet only shown the New Testament to have been really written by the first preachers of Christianity. The grand question now comes as to the *truth* of the religion they preached.

On examining the New Testament then, we find, that the Apostles' preaching consisted partly of some *facts* which they related, and partly of some *doctrines* which they taught. The first question evidently is—did the *facts* they relate really occur? Now with regard to the main outlines, especially the death and resurrection of Jesus, the evidence even from opposers of Christianity who lived in those days is so plain, that no one can attempt to dispute it. But

there are many important things, which Jesus said and did privately, and which therefore rest solely on the testimony of the Apostles, or other of Christ's immediate disciples. Is this testimony then to be relied on? Were they honest men, or deceivers and impostors? *Their miracles* are a sufficient answer: these must either have been wrought by the power of God or by the power of the devil; and as the persons, who consider the Apostles to have been either deceivers or deceived, never admit the existence of a devil, the argument is of course decisive against them, and it must therefore be acknowledged, that God himself thus openly set His seal on the Apostles, as His true and faithful witnesses. We must also mention the argument, which Paley brings out so strongly in his *Evidences of Christianity*, namely, the labours and sufferings which the Apostles underwent, for the sole purpose of making their religion widely known, and without any possible motive, except obedience to their Master's command and love to the souls of others. They must have known whether Jesus did say and do what they attested of him; and what motive could they possibly have in inventing a set of lies, and propagating them through the world? What was there to gain by it? What *did* they gain by it? Why persecutions, reproaches, contempt, imprisonments, and cruel deaths. Even supposing they thought this invention of their's would greatly benefit the world if generally believed; or supposing they were men of such ambition as to be willing to go through any thing to make themselves a name, as the founders of a new religion; how could they ever imagine, that the world would receive such a religion as they preached? With all the power of the magistrate, the wisdom of the philosopher, and the prejudice of the common people arrayed against them, what a hopeless attempt to overthrow the long established religion of the Roman empire; and that by a religion with nothing attractive, but every thing repulsive, to the carnal and worldly mind! How perfectly absurd to suppose that any man, or any set of men, could ever dream of making such an attempt, except with the certain conviction of the power of God being with them; which of course they could not have expected, if they had known themselves to be impostors. Experience too must soon have shewn them their mistake, had they ever any such expectations. For though many were no doubt converted to Christianity by their preaching, yet their converts were chiefly from the poorer classes, and those far from sufficient in number to turn the popular current in their favour. But the Apostles still held on their self-denying way; and after spending their lives in ignominy and toil for the sake of their religion, they all, with one exception, sealed

their testimony with their blood. Can any thing be more preposterous, than to doubt their honesty and sincerity? \*

The *facts* then, which the first preachers of Christianity related, we must assume to be true: Jesus did say and do, what is recorded of him in the gospels. But a further question arises now, as to the *doctrines* they taught: are we to receive them as *infallibly true*? This is of course another question; for a man may be honest and truthful in telling a story, but mistaken in his views and opinions about it: and here the Unitarians and we are immediately at issue. Mr. Barker asserts that the apostles were no more inspired than good men now are, and views their epistles as showing the effect produced by the life and teaching of Christ "*upon prejudiced and carnal minds.*" The teaching of Christ must have a most singular effect upon *his* mind, when he can hold such an opinion: for what does Christ say? "When they shall deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak; *for it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father, that speaketh in you.*"† Matt. x. 19, 20. Again, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark xvi. 15, 16. Now what is it which our Lord here solemnly declares any one shall be damned for disbelieving? Clearly *THE gospel, which he had just commissioned his apostles to preach.* And yet they were left quite fallible, to preach any kind of error or false doctrine, which their "prejudiced and carnal minds" might adopt!! How monstrous! Perhaps the most decisive passage however is John xvi. 10, 14, a passage especially important, because it exactly meets an argument continually brought forward by Unitarians, namely, that Christ being the great Prophet, it cannot be necessary to believe anything that He did not plainly teach with his own lips. "I have yet many things to

\* The rapid spread of Mahometanism, and the self torture of the Hindoo Brahmin are sometimes brought forward to weaken the force of this reasoning. But the Brahmin very likely does believe in the truth of his religion; and, if not, he is revered almost as a God by millions of admiring Hindoos. Mahomet was probably both a deceiver and deceived; his excited imagination may really have thought the angel Gabriel visited him in the solitary cave at Mecca; his ambition was gratified at being looked upon as the great Prophet, and his religion was spread *by force of arms*. In the case before us, the nature of the facts, and the number of the witnesses, preclude the possibility of their being *deceived*, and the evidence given above equally precludes the possibility of their being *deceivers*.

† space would permit, we might mention, among many other things, the *candour* of their statements. Is Peter's fall, or the contention between Paul and Barnabas, thing likely to have been invented, or if true to have been made public by interested, designing, ambitious men?

† If the facts related in the Gospels be true (which we have just proved them to be), no Unitarian or any one else will deny, that what Jesus says comes *with the authority of God*.

say unto you, *but ye cannot bear them now*. Howbeit, when He, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into ALL TRUTH; for he shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak, and he shall show you things to come. He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you." To which must be added what our Lord had said just before,—“These things have I spoken unto you being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” John xiv. 25, 26. From this we gather, that there were important truths, which Jesus had *not* taught himself, but which the Holy Ghost *would* teach the apostles; that there were other things, which he had concealed in parables, or otherwise obscurely taught, but which the Holy Ghost would open out and explain to them; and that by his inspiration they would infallibly be “guided into *all truth*.” So that we have here a clear warrant, first, for expecting to learn things from the apostles’ teaching, which cannot be learnt from our Lord’s own words; and secondly, for taking them as infallible interpreters of the meaning of what he *did* teach—in other words explaining the gospels by the epistles. Both these rules the Unitarians exactly reverse. We quite agree with them, that Jesus is the great Teacher; but we maintain, on his own authority, that he teaches us in great measure, by the mouth of his apostles, as God taught the Jews by the mouth of his prophets. And this method of *gradual developement* runs through the whole bible, both in regard to doctrine, practice, and prophecy. In the earlier revelations which were given to man, the statements of doctrine were comparatively obscure, the standard of practice comparatively low, and the unfolding of God’s future purposes very general and limited. As time went on, increased light was given on all these subjects, one thing being added at one time, and one at another, until in the New Testament we have the revelation completed and closed, the highest standard of practice being set before us in the gospels, the full statement of doctrine being contained in the epistles, and the final prophecy of “things to come” being afforded us in the book of Revelations.

It may here be objected, that the greater part of the epistles are written by St. Paul, who was not one of the apostles to whom our Lord gave His authoritative commission. True, he was not at that time, but he was afterwards, upon his miraculous conversion, especially appointed to be an apostle by Jesus himself; and in his writings he continually asserts his claim to the honour of apostleship, as an inspired preacher

of the gospel.\* Let us turn to a few passages. When Jesus was sending Ananias to him, he said, "Go thy way, for he is a *chosen vessel* unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel; for I will show him how great things he must suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias went his way, and entered into the house, and putting his hands on him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, that appeared unto thee in the way as thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be *filled with the Holy Ghost*.—Acts ix. 15—17. Some of the expressions in the 7th chapter of his first epistle to the Corinthians (see verses 6, 10, 12, 25, 40,) are brought forward to show, that he *disclaimed* infallibility. The meaning of the passages is very much disputed even amongst orthodox theologians: but it is quite unnecessary for us to enter into a critical examination of them, as the very interpretation our opponents put upon them directly overthrows their own argument; for if he means to say, that he was not authorised to express an infallible opinion *on that particular subject*, he must of course imply that he *was* authorised to do so, *on other subjects*. Suppose I should say in the middle of a sermon, Now mind, I'm not inspired to speak with authority on this point; wouldn't you immediately think to yourself, Why, does he mean to tell us he ever is so inspired? The words would naturally imply it: and so they do in St. Paul's case; and we have only to glance at his writings to see that he does claim inspiration in the highest sense of the word. Five passages may suffice, "If any man think himself to be a prophet or spiritual, let him acknowledge, that the things which I write unto you are the commandments of the Lord"—1 Cor. xiv. 37. "If I come again, I will not spare; since ye seek a proof of *Christ speaking in me*."—2 Cor. xiii. 2, 3. In the words 'I will not spare,' he alludes to the miraculous powers, which the apostles possessed, of inflicting diseases or other punishment upon great offenders in the Church: and on the strength of this power, which he threatens to exercise against his opposers, he challenges obedience to his commands, as being the commands of "Christ speaking in him." Again: "But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man; for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it, but *by revelation of Jesus Christ*."—Gal. i. 11, 12. Again: "For this cause thank we God without ceasing, because when ye received the word of God, which ye heard of us, ye received

\* The famous Jeremy Bentham saw so clearly the impossibility of getting over St. Paul's statements of doctrine, that, being determined not to receive them, he flatly denounced him as a designing impostor! This was something like honesty.



it, *not as the word of men*, but as it is in truth, the *word of God*."—Thess. ii. 13. Again; "*The Spirit speaketh expressly*, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith."—1 Tim. iv. 1. And, lastly; "For in nothing am I behind the very chiefest apostles, though I be nothing."—2 Cor. xii. 11.\*

We may now safely leave the New Testament, and turn to the Old. The authority of this follows as a matter of course; for it is so perpetually asserted by our Lord and his apostles, that it really is most astonishing how any one, who pretends to receive the New, can deny or doubt the Old, Testament. The only question is, whether the books we have now are the same books, neither more nor less, which went by the name of "the Scriptures," "the Law and the Prophets," &c. and which the Jews universally recognised as the inspired word of God. Happily this can be proved beyond the shadow of a doubt. The evidence is so full and complete, as to make the matter absolutely certain. The scrupulous, almost superstitious, care, with which the Jews have always guarded these sacred writings, counting even the very words and letters of every copy that was taken, to avoid the possibility of the slightest mistake, is quite notorious. "To them were committed the oracles of God," and *in this respect*, most faithful have they been to the trust. Until our Lord's time, we are solely indebted to them for their preservation: even since that time, they have been in the hands of Jews and Gentiles alike, appeals have been made to them in all controversies, persons of the most opposite opinion have referred to them as of undoubted authority, and, (except the attempt made by the Church of Rome to add the Apocrypha, *which the Jews never received*,) there has been a universal agreement as to the books of the Old Testament. Nothing can be more certain, than that what the Jews called "the Scriptures," and what we call "the Old Testament" are precisely the same: indeed few will be hardy enough to deny it. In what light then are we to view it? Hear Mr. Martineau's opinion.—"If with all their general historic truthfulness, these writings are, almost without exception, of unknown authorship, and therefore of unknown inspiration; if their antiquity carries them beyond the reach of all outward evidence of authority; if many of them are the venerable, but human, relics of a literature produced by a half

\* An objection is raised about Paul's "withstanding Peter to the face;" and it is asked, Which was infallible? We answer, Both—as *Teachers*; and Peter especially mentions his agreement in doctrine with Paul (2 Peter iii. 15.) Paul withstood him on this particular occasion, because, through fear of man, he had been led into an inconsistency, and dissembled *in his conduct*. It does not at all follow, because a man is inspired, that he should be entirely kept from sin: nay, St. John himself confesses, "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves." 1 John, i. 8. Witness also the case of David, and Solomon.

barbarous nation in wholly barbarous times: if they contain the ideas, the passions, the moral sentiments, of a simple but savage people; if they give expression to notions of right and wrong imbibed amid constant bloodshed, and to a religion which was without expectation of a future life; if among its hymns are the strains of a penitent adulterer, and its aphorisms the wisdom of an exhausted voluptuary,—is it not appalling that such an aggregate should be placed in youthful hands as the reflection of the Divine purity and the Oracle of the Infinite Intelligence?—that every effort should be made to gather round it the unquestioning reverence of early years, and form the moral taste from its mixed elements? The party cry of the present day about scripture education demands great plainness of speech, and I scruple not to denounce it as a demoralising and corrupting superstition.”

Many Unitarians however do not go so far as this. They admit that the books of the Old Testament *were* inspired, but that their authority has been superseded by the New Testament, and consequently that they are of no further use to us. Now what does “the great Teacher” say to all this? Among the many serious charges he makes against the Jews, especially the scribes and pharisees, does he ever accuse them of adding to or taking from “the oracles of God,” which had been committed to their keeping? Does he ever tell them what a mistake it was, their supposing these books to be the infallible word of God? Does he even warn them against the “appalling” sin of “placing such an aggregate in youthful hands”? Does he ever say, that a new dispensation having commenced, they were no longer to be appealed to, as of any authority? Every child knows, that he says nothing of the kind; but, on the contrary, that he always speaks of “*the scriptures*” “*the word of God*,” &c. as a definite, fixed, well-known collection of writings; that he continually refers to them as an *infallible guide*, and an *authoritative standard of appeal*, without giving the least caution, that *un-authorised* or *un-inspired* writings had got mixed amongst them; and that he expressly tells us, that his mission did *not* overthrow their authority. This we shall proceed to show from his own words.

Let us begin with two passages, which may be thought to favour the opposite view,—“Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your tradition.” Matt. xv., 3. A moment’s consideration of the context\* will shew that our Lord does not accuse them of adding their traditions *as part of the Bible*, (which it is well known they never attempted to do)

\* The context means the verses before or after the text in question; in fact, its connexion with what the speaker was then saying.

but of distorting and explaining away its meaning by their own *false interpretations*. The interpretations, with a vast number of absurd rules invented by their rabbies, were collected together in a separate volume, called the Talmud ; which was kept quite distinct from the Bible, though by many of the Jews regarded as of equal authority. They were called traditions, because *handed down* from one generation to another. Now the one of these Jesus always appeals to, as the infallible word of God ; the other he rejects, as of only *human* authority ; but never hints, that the two had got at all mixed together. The next objection appears at first sight to have more weight. It is taken from the 5th chapter of St. Matthew, where Jesus seems to repeal some of the laws of Moses. Mr. Barker's words are—" You say the Bible is an infallible guide. Now the Bible means the whole of the books from Genesis to Revelations. But those books lead contrary ways. I take your infallible guide, and open it, and my eye falls on the words,—An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth, and life for life. Shall I follow it ? While I am pondering the injunction, I open the book again, and it says,—It *was* said by them of *old* time, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth ; *but I* say unto you, resist *not* evil, &c. Is this all one guide ? And can this two-mouthed guide, this double-tongued director, that would lead me east and west at the same time, be an infallible guide ?" By the same ingenious method the teaching of Christ himself may be proved to be " a two-mouthed guide." " I take up one of the Gospels, and my eye falls on the words—Sleep on now, and take your rest. Shall I follow it ? While I am pondering this injunction, I open the book again, and it says—Watch and pray. Is this all one guide ?" &c. The Bible no more tells *him* to exact an eye for an eye, than it tells *me* to sleep on and take my rest. What *does* the Bible tell him ? Why it tells him, in the 21st chapter of Exodus, that the *Israelites were* allowed to exact an eye for an eye, and in the 5th of St. Matthew, that *he is not* allowed to do so. Is it possible that he has not sufficient penetration to see the perfect consistency of this ? or that he can have overlooked the fact, that, at the beginning of this very sermon, Jesus specially guarded himself against being thought to overthrow the law of Moses by anything he was about to say ? " Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets : I am not come to destroy,\* but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, till heaven

\* " I challenge all the orthodox party in the world to prove that the law of Jesus is not better than the law of Moses, and of course different from it ; or to shew that the law of Moses is *not annulled and thrown down*, and the law of Christ established in its stead, to be our rule for ever and ever." As far as any truth is

and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled. Whosoever, *therefore*, shall break one of these least commandments, *and shall teach men so*, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." The reason why the Israelites were allowed to do certain things, which Christians are not allowed to do, is that we have more light and greater privileges than they had, and "to whom much is given, of him is much required." In his sermon on the Mount, Jesus, being about to introduce a new dispensation, (not *opposed* to, but a future *developement* of, the Mosaic dispensation), shows that a higher standard of holiness would be required of his disciples, in proportion to the greater advantages they would enjoy.

Let us now turn to a few other passages, and see whether our Lord does not invariably speak of *the Old Testament* as a divinely-inspired, infallible, authoritative book. And if he does, what are we to think of the man, who is perpetually insisting, that a Christian is one who submits to the teaching of Christ, and yet writes as follows? "The differences between the different books of the Bible are endless; and will you pretend, that when those clashing and contradictory books happen to be all bound together in one large volume, that they instantly become a consistent and infallible guide? Here are fifty or a hundred books, one leading you one way, another a contrary way, and several of them leading you no way at all; yet these books, when the book-binder and printer agree to put them all together, are to make one everlasting and infallible guide. Do you really believe such nonsense?"

Matt. iv. 4, 10,—Here, to each temptation of Satan Jesus replies by a passage from the Old Testament, saying, "It is *written*," &c.

Matt. xxi. 42,—"*Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected,*" &c.

Matt. xxii. 29 and 32,—"*Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.*" "*Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God,*" &c. Observe how he ascribes their infidelity to ignorance of *the Old Testament*, and confounds them by appealing to it.

Matt. xxvi. 24 and 31,—"*The Son of Man goeth as it is written of him.*" "*All ye shall be offended in me this night; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad.*"

Mark ix. 12,—"*And he answered and told them, Elias verily*

contained in this, "the orthodox party" are agreed with him; as to the rest, the passage above may open the eyes of some, who are led away by his bold assertions and vaunting challenges.

cometh first, and restoreth all things; and how *it is written* of the Son of Man, that he *must* suffer many things, and be set at nought."

Mark xii. 31,—“For David himself said *by the Holy Ghost*,” &c.

Luke xvi. 31,—“If they believe not *Moses and the Prophets*, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.” What fatal words to rejecters of the Old Testament!!

Luke xviii. 31,—“Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and *all things that are written by the Prophets concerning the Son of Man shall be accomplished.*”

Luke xxi. 22,—“For these be the days of vengeance, *that all things which are written may be fulfilled.*”

Luke xxiv. 25,—“Then he said unto them, O fools and slow of heart to believe *all that the Prophets* have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning at Moses, and all the Prophets, he expounded unto them in all the *scriptures* the things *concerning himself.*”

Luke xxiv. 44, 46,—“These are the words, which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that *all things must be fulfilled, which are written* in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their understandings, that they might understand *the scriptures*, and said unto them, *Thus it is written*, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer,” &c. “The law of Moses,” “the Prophets,” and “the Psalms,” were the names given by the Jews to their three divisions of the Old Testament. Observe, Christ must open our understandings, before we can “understand the scriptures.”

John v. 39 and 46,—“Search *the scriptures*: for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they *which testify of me.*” “For had ye believed *Moses*, ye would have believed me, for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not *his writings*, how shall ye believe *my words.*”

John x. 34, 35.—“Is it not written *in your law*, I said, ye are Gods? If he called them Gods, unto whom the word of God came, and *the scripture can not be broken.*”

So much for *the teaching of Christ*. Let us now see whether his apostles follow him in this.

Acts i. 16.—Peter says, “This scripture *must needs* have been fulfilled, which *the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before* concerning Judas.”

Acts iv. 24.—“Lord, thou art God, \* \* \* *who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said.*”

Acts xvii. 11.—“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readi-

ness of mind, and *searched the scriptures daily*, whether those things were so."

Acts xxvi. 22 & 27.—"I continue to this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which the prophets and Moses did say should come." "King Agrippa believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest"

Acts xxviii. 25.—"Well spake the Holy Ghost *by Esaias (Isaiah) the prophet.*"

Rom. i. 2.—"The gospel of God, which *He* had promised afore *by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures*"

Rom. iii. 2.—"Unto them (that is, the Jews) were committed *the oracles of God.*"

Rom. ix. 25 —"As *He* (that is, God) saith also *in Osee*"; that is, by the prophet Hosea.

Rom. xv. 4.—"For whatsoever things were written *afore-time*, were written for our learning, that *we* through patience and comfort of *the scriptures* might have hope."

2 Tim. iii. 14—17.—"But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known *the Holy Scriptures*, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. *All Scripture* is given *by inspiration of God*, and is *profitable* for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." When Timothy was "a child" not a word of the *New Testament* had been written: therefore from the whole passage we learn, that *all the old Testament* is "holy," "inspired," "profitable," and that it is able of itself to teach us the plan of "Salvation through faith" in Christ. Yet these are the writings, of which Mr. Martineau says it is "appalling," that they should be placed in *youthful* hands; and which Mr. Barker pronounces "clashing and contradictory," and, when joined to the *New Testament*, "a two mouthed guide and a double-tongued director."

2 Pet. i. 21.—"For the prophecy came *not* in old time *by the will of man*: but holy men of God spake as they were moved *by the Holy Ghost.*"

From all which it appears that the views on this subject held by the "prejudiced and carnal" minds of the apostles were very much nearer "the teaching of Christ" than the views of many in these "enlightened days" of "independent thought" and "free inquiry." If the apostles had been living now, and had written their epistles for the express purpose of flatly contradicting *every one* of Mr. Barker's opinions on

the inspiration of scripture, could they have done so more pointedly than in some of the above passages? **THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT MUST STAND OR FALL TOGETHER.** There is not an inch of ground, on which any man can consistently stand, between acknowledging the *full inspiration*, *Divine authority*, and *infallible truth* of the *whole Bible*,—and the *total rejection* of it, as the production of designing impostors or deluded fanatics. “Choose ye this day whom ye will serve.” May you all have grace to say, “As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord.” \*

Into the various *internal* evidences of the Bible coming from God, which Paley and others have so ably brought forward, time will not allow us to enter. I cannot however forbear to notice, that “the endless differences” which *appear* to exist in the various books, and which are produced *against* them, become when closely examined, one of the strongest arguments in *their favour*. For supposing them not to have been inspired, the person, or persons who “put them together in one volume” in order to “palm them” upon us as the Word of God, would have taken pretty good care to remove all these “awkward passages,” and to make them agree very closely together, so that every thing should be quite clear and straightforward, no stumbling-blocks left in the way, nothing in short, that any opponent might make a handle of. But with all the show of agreement, which would then have appeared on the face of it, there can be no doubt, but that the more closely it was examined, the more its different books would have been found to *disagree* in little points, which the *compilers* of it had overlooked. The *apparent agreement* would have become on examination, *real contradiction*. Now every well-informed Christian knows, that in *both* these particulars, the case is *exactly the reverse*. The Bible is full of what *appear at first sight*, obvious, palpable, and glaring inconsistencies, such as no one who wished to palm it upon us as an infallible guide, *if he dared have altered a word of it*, would have allowed to remain for a moment. And yet these very inconsistencies, when thoroughly investigated, are found

\* There is one book of the Old Testament, the Song of Solomon, which is as much scoffed at even as the book of Revelations; and for the same reason—because it is not understood. In both cases ignorance is the parent of unbelief; in the one case ignorance of history, in the other of Christian experience. The Song of Solomon is a book, which above all others can only be “spiritually discerned.” Under the figure of a bridal song in honour of Solomon’s marriage, it describes the varied experience of a true believer; and to such a one no book is more full of meaning, or comes more plainly stamped with the seal of God. To those however whose religion consists merely in outward morality, who know nothing of the Spirit’s work *upon* the heart and *in* the heart, nay who laugh at the very mention of it, it must of course appear unmeaning and unedifying; and no wonder that, on the boasted principle of human reason, they should reject it altogether.

to give way, and to exhibit the most beautiful harmony. In books written centuries apart and by men of various dispositions and habits, containing statements at first sight opposite enough, a diligent and patient examination discovers such a perfect agreement in the minutest particulars, as could only have been produced by their being written under the immediate direction of God. Another thing to be observed in the style of the Bible, which confirms our view, is the utter disregard of clearing up difficulties or answering cavils. Unlike all human writings, there is not the slightest attempt to *guard* its statements, or to smooth down its doctrines so as to make them less offensive: in fact its style is, what we should call in any thing else, *injudicious*, and that to an extreme. The most startling truths are broadly stated in their naked simplicity without the slightest reserve—statements that won't bend an inch, that will break our necks if we attempt to climb *over*, and that we can only pass in safety by bowing down and creeping *under*. A person once expressed an opinion, that "the Bible was written by a man of unsound mind"; and this was the most consistent thing an infidel ever said; for no one of sound mind would ever have dreamed of writing such a book, *unless under the immediate direction of God himself*. Learn then never to be shaken or unsettled in your mind by any difficulties, objections, or apparent contradictions being brought against the Bible: if you can't see how to reconcile them, some one else perhaps can; the Spirit enlightens one on this point, and another on that point, that we may cultivate a spirit of mutual dependence and "edify one another": and when a little experience has shown you, that difficulties, which appeared insurmountable to you, can be satisfactorily cleared up by another, you will learn to wait patiently and contentedly, and not to waver in unbelief or doubt, should any difficulties be raised, which you can find *no one* to explain to your satisfaction.

There is one answer, however, which the true Christian, but no one else, can give to them all; an answer that requires no learning, no talent, no long course of reading to give; and yet a more conclusive answer to *his* mind, than fifty volumes from the most powerful writer—"He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." Yes, this answer, and this alone, can "quench all the fiery darts of the wicked one." You may try to perplex him with arguments, or overwhelm him with difficulties; but touched with this weapon they vanish into nothing. The waves of the Red sea may foam before him, threatening to arrest his progress, the host of Pharaoh may press on behind as sure of victory; but this rod, stretched over the waters in the name of the Lord,



divides the sea, and he walks over on dry land. And let me tell you, however useful all other answers may be, this is the only one that can place a man beyond the reach of danger in such times as these. The mere nominal Christian, who has no ballast to steady him, may make shipwreck of his faith at the first gust of wind, and become a Romanist, or Socinian, or anything else, just as the blow happens to be given him. But the believer, who has the witness in himself, is safe; "My Father, which gave them me, is greater than all, and no man is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand." No! *he* cannot be made to doubt that the Bible is the word of God, by all the sophistries or ingenuity in the world. He knows what it has done for him; he knows its power upon his own soul; it has shewn him a remedy for his disease, a recovery from his ruin, a way of access to his offended Father; in a word, it has led him by the Spirit's blessing to the foot of the cross. There the burden dropped off his back, and he experienced "the blessedness of him whose transgressions are forgiven, and whose sins are covered." He has "joy and peace in believing,"—that peace "which the world can neither give, nor take away." And do you think that he would give up his Bible, to which he is indebted for all this, or be persuaded that it is the word of man, because he may'nt be able to answer all the objections or difficulties that can be raised against it? No! *he that believeth hath the witness in himself*: and that witness is beyond the power of earth or hell to shake. "He shall not be afraid of the pestilence that walketh in darkness, nor for the destruction that wasteth at noon-day. A thousand may fall at his side," by the dark superstitions of Popery, "and ten thousand at his right hand," by the open assaults of infidelity, "but it shall not come nigh" *him*; his "life is hid with Christ in God;" he has drank of the fountain of living waters, and they are "in him as a well of water springing up into everlasting life." May God give us all grace, so to drink of it, that we may thirst no more, for Jesus Christ's sake. Amen.

EXTRACT FROM "IT IS WRITTEN" BY PROFESSOR  
GAUSSEN.

"Having read other books, if you feel the need of spiritual aliment, open the Bible, and hear it. Sometimes it is melodious with the songs of angels : but it is of angels visiting the children of Adam ; at others, it pours forth the full tide of heaven's harmony, to cheer the heart of man, and to awaken the conscience, in the shepherd's cot, as in the palace, in the garrets of poverty, as in the tents of the desert. The Bible in fact instructs all conditions of men : it unmasks alike the humble and the great ; revealing equally to both the love of God, and unveiling the same mysteries. It addresses itself to children ; and it is often children who there shew us the way to heaven and the majesty of the Lord. It addresses itself to shepherds ; and it is often shepherds who are then presented to us, to reveal the character of God. It speaks to kings and scribes ; and it is often they who therein teach us the misery of man, humility, confession and prayer. Domestic scenes, compunctions of conscience, secret effusions of prayer, travels, proverbs, outpourings of heart, the holy walk of a child of God, unveiled weaknesses, falls, restorations, inward experiences, parables, familiar epistles, theological expositions, sacred commentaries on some ancient scripture, national chronicles, military annals, political development, descriptions of God, portraits of angels, heavenly visions, practical exhortations, rules of life, solutions of mental difficulties, judgments of the Lord, sacred songs, predictions of the future, accounts anterior to creation, sublime odes, and inimitable poetic imagery—all these by turns present themselves to our view in full and grateful variety, and as a whole captivate us like the majesty of a temple. It is thus that the Bible, from its first page to its last, was intended to associate with its sublime unity the attractive features of a human-like, familiar, sympathetic, personal instruction,—and a drama of forty centuries. As has been said in the Bible of Desmarets, "There are shallows for lambs, and deep waters in which elephants may swim."

"But see, at the same time what unity, and what innumerable and harmonious combinations appear in this immense variety ! Under manifold forms we have always the same truth presented to us ; always man lost, and God in the character of a Saviour : always the first Adam driven from Eden, and losing the tree of life, and the second Adam with his ransomed ones re-entering Paradise, and finding again the tree of life ; always the same cry in ten thousand tones—"O heart of man, return to thy God, for thy God pardons ! Ye are in the abyss ; escape out of it ; a Saviour has descended into it. He giveth holiness and life."

## LECTURE III.

### ON HUMAN REASON.

ACTS xxv. 12.—“Hast thou appealed unto Cæsar? Unto Cæsar shalt thou go.”

THE objections urged by Unitarians against the doctrines of the gospel are drawn partly from scripture, and partly from reason. Those from scripture will be considered separately as each doctrine in turn comes before us; but the question of reason it will be better to settle at once in the very outset. And though we are told, that it is not “solely or chiefly” on the score of reason they reject certain doctrines, yet any one acquainted with their writings must be quite aware how much this weapon is made use of, and how much more effect it is likely to have upon a large class of minds, than any arguments from the word of God.\* Now if you will examine the various objections brought forward by Unitarians *apart from scripture*, you will find that they all resolve themselves into these two; 1st, a *physical* difficulty, namely—Such and such a thing appears *impossible*; I don’t see *how* it can be so: and 2dly, a *moral* difficulty, namely, I don’t see how such and such thing would be *right*, or consistent with the character of God. The first objection applies to the Trinity for instance: no Unitarian pretends to say there would be anything *wrong* in Father, Son, and Spirit being each God, and yet there being only one God; but it appears to him *impossible*. The second applies to original sin for instance: there is no physical difficulty in believing the *possibility* of children being born in sin; but it is thought to be a stain on the *moral* government of God. On

\* Such expressions as—“A man that believes the doctrine of the Trinity must be either a knave or a fool”—tell wonderfully upon a crowd; especially if they forget, that the man who says so believed it himself, or pretended to believe it, only the other day.

these two points then we join issue at the bar of reason; and we contend that reason herself, if properly exercised, would teach you the folly of disbelieving anything *on either of these grounds*. But before going to the proof, let us clear up a little mistake, that we may fairly understand each other. You ask, How can I believe what I don't understand? Before answering that, we must know what you mean. Suppose I say to an ignorant untaught child, Do you believe the doctrine of the Trinity? he might answer, I can't believe what I don't understand; I never heard the word before, I don't know what it means! In that case no one would expect him to believe it, because there is nothing for him to believe. But suppose I went on to give him a course of religious instruction, and explained to him what the doctrine of the Trinity meant, and then when I asked him, Do you believe it now? he replied, No, I can't: I understand what you mean by it, but it seems impossible;—this would be another thing altogether. In this case we *should* blame him, and tell him, as we tell you, that it is most *irrational* to bring such an objection as that against it. Which of these two do Unitarians mean, when they talk of "the abstruse subtleties" and "mysterious dogmas" of the Athanasian creed? If the former, they only want a little explanation, which any well-informed Christian can give them; if the latter, it is faith they want, which only God can give them. Let us now proceed to exercise our reason on *the works of God*.

Take first the physical difficulty; on which a very few words will suffice. Look at that sturdy oak. How did it come there? Why a century ago a small acorn like this in my hand was put into the ground, which first rotted away, and then grew up into this great tree. How ridiculous! You don't want me to believe such a preposterous absurdity! Why it's impossible. How *can* it be so? That's more than I or any one else can tell you; it's done by the power of God in some way, but *how*—is a mystery: 'no greater mystery though, than every blade of grass under your feet, than every atom of animal and vegetable life around you. If you'll believe nothing that is a mystery, nothing that you can't explain or understand, you must keep your eyes shut: for every time you open them they'll say, Thou fool! Precisely in this way St. Paul argues, when, after stating the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, he supposes some one to bring forward an objection from human reason—"How are the dead raised up, and *with what body* do they come?" He refers him to the mysteries of creation; "Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body which shall be, but bare grain, it may chance of wheat or of some other grain, but God giveth it a body, *as it*

*hath pleased him*"—1 Cor. xv, 35,—38: as much as to say, You don't refuse to believe things beyond your comprehension, when *experience* declares them; then why should you refuse to do so, when *God's word* declares them? This is the first lesson reason teaches us.

We now come to *moral* difficulties, which form the second class of objections. The Unitarian here assumes that he is a competent judge as to what would be *right* and what would be *wrong* for God to do.\* He cannot believe such and such doctrines, because they make God appear unjust or unkind. Now this we call most *irrational*; because *reason* herself, if properly exercised on the works of creation, would teach you that, however competent you may be to decide what would be right and wrong in a *man like yourself*, you are not competent to do so, with regard to *God*. Look at this little fly sporting about in the full enjoyment of life and health and happiness. Examine it with the microscope, and observe how wisely and beautifully all its parts are formed. See how merrily it dances in the sunbeam. But look again: the poor little thing has incautiously touched a cobweb; a spider darts out, seizes hold of it, and puts it to a lingering death. How angry you feel at the ugly looking brute! but hold—who taught the spider to do it? who made it necessary that he must either kill flies or starve to death? Let us suppose four persons arguing on this little circumstance—an Atheist, a Manichæan, a Unitarian, and an orthodox Christian. *A*.—It is quite evident from this, as well as from all the misery and sufferings of the brute creation, that there can be no God at all, or at all events not an Almighty one; for he would never have allowed the world to be in the state it is, if he could have prevented it. *M*.—I quite agree with you as to the impossibility of believing that all these things come from one great, good, omnipotent Being; for a Being that allows innocent animals to suffer, when he might prevent it, can neither be just nor good. But my theory is, that there are two Gods, one good and the other bad, and that all the good in the world comes from one, and all the bad from the other. *U*.—I beg to differ with you both. I believe it was the same God who made both the spider and fly; that there is but one God, that he is perfectly just and good, that his very name is love, and "his tender mercies are over all his works." *A*.—Impossible! if there is but one God, and that an almighty one, he must be anything but a God of

\* Take one specimen from Mr. Barker:—"If there were such a God as the Calvinistic doctrine supposes, blasphemy would be no longer a sin, but a duty and a virtue. It would be men's duty to denounce and reprobate such a being. The very worst censures they could utter against such a God would be eternally too light." This supposes some moral standard of right and wrong in the Universe independent of God, by which his creatures may judge of his conduct.

love, and "I had rather weep with the weeping, howl with the howling, and die with the dying, than accept of a favour from such a partial, arbitrary, unreasonable, cruel, and malignant Being." Look at all the cruelties that dumb animals suffer from man, and from one another; and explain, if you can, *how* God's tender mercies are over them, and *how* he can be a God of love, when he permits all this. *U.*—Oh, I don't pretend to be able to *account for it*, or to reconcile it with *our* ideas of justice and benevolence, but still I believe it; there is evidently something about it we don't understand, which may be explained to us in another world; then the whole mystery may be cleared up, and we may see the perfect justice and benevolence of things which at present appear wholly irreconcilable with them. *O. C.*—Perfectly true: but don't you see how exactly you have answered your own objections to many of the doctrines of revelation? You allow that God does some things which appear contrary to his moral attributes, *because you see them*; then why not believe other things, which may also appear so, because they are *told you in God's word*? The sufferings of the brute creation are a *moral mystery*, which yet you believe will some day be cleared up; then why not any thing else, however staggering it may appear to our finite minds?—This is the second lesson reason teaches us.

Now it is a favourite saying of Unitarians, with which we quite agree, that if the Bible be the word of God, it cannot contradict what is taught us by the works of creation: His word and works must harmonize. Let us then turn to the Bible, and see whether its teaching concerning the mystery of God's ways agrees with what our reason has already discovered from the works of creation.

Prov. xxv. 2. "It is the glory of God to *conceal* a thing." And what is the glory of the creature? It is to bow and to believe—to love and to obey: to receive with unquestioning submission whatever the Creator is pleased to *reveal* concerning himself, and to be content to remain in ignorance of whatever he is pleased to *conceal*. It is the glory of the infinite Jehovah, that however much he may make known to his creatures, there is always *more kept back*. And this will remain equally true throughout eternity. All created intelligences will be for ever learning more and more of God, and yet however far they may have advanced, there will always be more to learn than has been learned already. Each fresh discovery will only increase our thirst for another, and we never can have discovered all,—for God is *infinite*. As countless ages roll on, new worlds will be created, new systems produced, new orders of beings called into existence, from each one of which we may learn more of God, than we ever knew before: so that a boundless ocean of knowledge and happiness

will still stretch out before us, which eternity can not tire us exploring, nor eternity ever have explored: it will still be "the glory of God to conceal a thing." All creation will thus be kept in humble, in conscious dependence and prostrate submission before their Maker's footstool. And yet a little atom in the universe, called man, dares to exalt his reason against the word of this infinite Jehovah, to judge what it would be right and what it would be wrong for God to do, to say he can't believe this, because he does not understand it, or he will not believe that, because it is contrary to *his* ideas of justice or benevolence! Well is it written, "Vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt!"

Ps. xcvi. 2. "Clouds and darkness are round about him, righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne."\* No, says the Unitarian, I'll not believe that righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his throne, unless the clouds and darkness can be cleared away. But they cannot; for in this world the Christian is to "walk by faith, not by sight." How is it with you? Can you be content that the clouds and darkness should remain, and yet feel perfectly certain that righteousness and judgment are behind them? If so, praise: if not, pray.

Ps. lxxvii. 19. "Thy way is in the sea, and thy path in the great waters, and *thy footsteps are not known.*"

Job xi. 7—12. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth and broader than the sea. If he cut off, or shut up, or gather together, then who can hinder him? For he knoweth vain man: he seeth wickedness also; will he not then consider it? For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt."

Isaiah, lv. 8, 9.—"For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts."

Surely we need go no farther: God's word and works *do* agree; and they tell us that the great Author of them both is beyond the grasp of our intellect. But a further question arises. Acknowledging this general truth, is it likely that such difficulties will be found in the *plan of Salvation*, or in the book which contains it? Now as St. Paul argues (Rom i. 20) that the heathen were *without excuse* for not knowing God

\* If we add to the above text St. Paul's words, "Great is the mystery of Godliness," we shall be able to see the full force of Mr. Barker's argument. "When you ask an orthodox Christian about his belief, you lose him and he loses you, it's all *darkness and clouds*, and he ends by telling you it's a *mystery.*"

from the works of creation (and yet we have seen that there are great mysteries in those works), it follows of course, that if mysteries be found in *the gospel*, it will afford us no excuse for disbelieving it. Let us then, without entering at present into any disputed doctrines, see what the Bible leads us to expect generally about the truths therein revealed. And the first thing that strikes us is, that the gospel is about fourteen times called "*a mystery*" in the New Testament. In reply to this, it is asserted that the same thing cannot be a mystery and a revelation; that when a thing is revealed it ceases to be a mystery: and on the mere strength of this theory, Mr. Barker tells us, that when St. Paul said, "Great IS the mystery of Godliness," he refers to what it WAS, before being revealed. In proof of this he goes on to show, that all the doctrines there mentioned ("God was manifest in the flesh," &c.) are, according to *his* view, "plain, simple, natural truths, about which there is no mystery at all,"—a very plain simple proof, that his view of what the words mean is not the view St. Paul had, when he wrote them; for to him they appeared a "*great mystery*." But let us examine this theory, and see what it is worth.—The same thing can't be a mystery and a revelation.—Suppose I *reveal* or *make known* to a child that the sun does not move round the earth, but always stands perfectly still in the same place.\* "How mysterious!" he exclaims; "Why it's shining on the west side of the house now, and it was shining on the east side this morning, was it not?" "Yes it was; and yet it has never stirred." "Well," says the child, "I believe it, because I'm sure you wouldn't tell me so, if it was not true; but it seems a great mystery." "How can that be, now that it's *revealed* to you?" I reply. "Having become a *revelation*, it must cease to be a *mystery*." "Oh no! it was only at your revelation that it *begun* to be a mystery: before you *revealed* to me that the sun stood still, I thought it turned round the earth, and so there was no mystery at all: but now I'm quite confounded, and all I can do, is to believe the fact on your word, and wait till the difficulty is cleared up." From this simple illustration we see not only that a revealed thing may remain in mystery, but that it must be in some measure and way revealed, *before it can be a mystery at all*. The Atonement can be no mystery to an African or Hindoo who has never heard a word about it; the doctrine must first be *revealed* or made known to him, and then, as in the case of the child just mentioned, it will begin to be a mystery to him. It's true I might have gone on to make *another revelation* to the child, which would have cleared up the mystery produced by the first revelation,—namely, that the earth turns

\* That is, as far as our system is concerned.



round the sun : but to exercise his faith, patience, and humility, I at first let him only "know in part;" I revealed *the fact* to him, but did not reveal what would have explained the *difficulties* of it. This is just what God has done to us. He has revealed as much as he sees good for us; but he has kept so much back, that the whole is enveloped in mystery; we only see a few separate links of the chain, which stretches from eternity to eternity—"It is the glory of God to conceal a thing."\*

But we are here met by another objection; namely, that "doctrines confessedly mysterious cannot be *operative*;" that is, of course, cannot affect the heart or life. Take another illustration; and remember what our Lord says about receiving the kingdom of God as *little children*. I show a child a particular bottle containing some liquid, of which I tell him he must never touch a drop, assuring him that if he does he will die immediately. "How very mysterious!" he says, "I can't conceive why I should die by just tasting that liquor, which looks only like water; but I'm sure I shouldn't have been told so, if it wasn't true, and therefore I'll take care never to touch it." So that the revelation I made to the child about that bottle is a perpetual mystery to him, but it *operates* so much as to prevent him ever tasting it, and so keeps him from being poisoned.—*How* the doctrines of the gospel operate, this is of course not the place to show: all that has been proved at present is that their being mysterious does not necessarily make them either "incredible" or "inoperative." We therefore fall back upon the apostle's declaration, "Great is the mystery of godliness," and draw from it this important fact—That any gospel which is *not* a mystery cannot be the gospel *St. Paul* preached. See Gal. i. 8. Further proof can scarcely be required; but it may be as well just to quote the following passages. "Now we see through a glass *darkly*; but then face to face: now I know *in part*," &c. 1 Cor. xiii. 12.—"O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God; how *unsearchable* are his judgments, and his ways *past finding out*." Rom. xi. 33.—"The *unsearchable* riches of Christ." Eph. iii. 8.—"That ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints, what is the *breadth* and *length* and *depth* and *height*, and to know the love of Christ *which passeth knowledge*, that ye might be filled with all the fulness of God." Eph. iii. 17—19.

Here we must notice two texts, which are brought on the opposite side. The first is St. Paul's expression, 2 Cor. xi. 3, "The simplicity that is in Christ." To which it need only be

Are not *the existence of a God*, the resurrection of the body, &c., &c. revealed doctrines? And is there no mystery in *them*?

answered, that the word "simplicity" in English may either mean the reverse of *mystery*, or the reverse of *duplicity*, but that the original word in the Greek means simplicity in the latter sense, *not* in the former; as may be seen immediately from another text, where it occurs—"He that giveth, let him do it with simplicity." Rom. xii. 18. It refers chiefly to uprightness, and purity of motive; but has nothing whatever to do with things being mysterious or not mysterious.—The second argument is taken from Isaiah xxxv. 8: "The wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein." Now if I was to remind you that the prophet is here speaking of the millennium, you would say, that Christians have always been in the habit of applying it to the gospel during the present dispensation. So they have; and the propriety of thus using it, *by way of application*, we admit. But what then is the meaning of it? You won't say it means that *no* wayfaring men *will ever err*, because some wayfaring men are trinitarians, and others atheists. The most, I suppose, you will contend for, is that none *need* err *because* they are wayfaring men or fools. This we quite agree to: but the question is, *why* need not their ignorance make them err? It cannot be because the doctrines of the gospel are "plain, simple, *natural* truths," for (not to mention the proofs already given to the contrary) "The *natural* man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are *foolishness* unto him."\* Then why is it? The conclusion of the last mentioned text gives you the answer, "neither can he know them, because *they are spiritually discerned*." 1 Cor. ii. 14. Here we get at the truth. As long as a man remains in his "*natural*" unrenewed state, the gospel is "*foolishness*" to him, whether he be a wayfaring man or not: he may have a certain head knowledge of it from education or other causes, and he may think he believes it; but he has no more power "*spiritually*" to "*discern*" it, than the professed unbeliever. Still, however foolish and ignorant he may be, he need not "*err therein*"; and why? Because God "*gives his Holy Spirit to them that ask him*." How plainly are we here shown the cause both of faith and unbelief! One man goes to the Bible trusting to great learning, another to common sense, both thinking that nothing more than human reason is wanted to understand it; but neither great learning nor common sense can discern spiritual things—it requires a *spiritual sense* to do that. The strongest glasses wouldnt help a man to see, who was born blind; *eye sight* must first be given him, and then he *can* get some assistance from them. You may pore over the bible all your life, and never find out the way of salvation; you may be "ever learning, and never

\* Observe from this, that no gospel can be from the "Spirit of God," which is not "*foolishness*" to "the natural man."

able to come to the knowledge of the truth;" for "no man can say that Jesus is the Christ, *but by the Holy Ghost.*" If you will trust to the strength of your own understanding to fathom the depths of God's word, if you will not acknowledge your own blindness, and humbly pray for the Spirit to enlighten you, "to take of the things of Christ and show them unto you,"—you'll remain in utter darkness, notwithstanding all your professions of "truth-seeking;" for "the meek," and the meek only, "will he guide in judgment." Ps. xxv. 9. Truth must not only be sought in God's book, but also from God's Spirit, and in God's way; and if you are too proud or indifferent to seek it in that way, you'll never find it—in any other. Let real "truth-seekers" consider the following passages, besides what have been already mentioned, and they will see how it may be found even by "wayfaring men, though fools." "*Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law.*" Psalm cxix. 18. "Then *opened he their understandings, that they might understand the scriptures.*" Luke xxiv. 45. "Whose heart *the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul.*" Acts xvi. 14. Unitarians tell us they don't set up their reason *above* the scriptures, they only use it *to understand* the scriptures; and they ask, whether we don't do the same? No doubt we do; but we first pray that our blind reason may be enlightened from above. In the prayer, "Open thou mine eyes," we confess that our eyes want opening, and that it is only by the Spirit shining upon his own word and into our hearts, that we can savingly discern the "*deep things of God.*" Having done this, we then apply the whole power of our mind to "search the scriptures," believing that God, in answer to our prayer, will bless the effort, and show us "*wondrous things out of his law.*" We could no more expect to learn "the mysteries of the kingdom of Heaven" without exercising our reason on God's word, than we could without feeling our natural blindness and praying for Divine light. "These things ought ye to have done, but not to leave the other undone." Oh that every unconverted person here, whatever be his professed belief, would meditate and pray over these words, "*Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.*"

But another question arises here, which is this. When a man thus humbly and earnestly seeks for Divine light, is he to expect that every difficulty will be removed, and every mystery cleared up? By no means. Many things no doubt that seemed at first quite dark will be gradually unfolded to him, he will of course "grow in grace and in the knowledge of Christ;" but if he should reach to the spiritual attainments of St. Paul, he will still have to exclaim, "Oh the depth!" The

effect of the Spirit's teaching is to shew him what is the truth, to give him faith to receive it, and grace to adorn it. Whatever mystery or difficulty there may appear in anything which he finds revealed, he has no difficulty in *believing it*: he can believe the greatest mystery just as easily as the simplest fact. The following passages of scripture, besides strengthening our main argument, will shew, that it is not by its mysteries being removed, but by our becoming willing to bend to them, that the gospel enters our understandings and our hearts. "If any man among you seemeth to be wise in this world, *let him become a fool*, that he may be wise." 1 Cor. iii 18, 19. "Do you think I'm going to be such a fool as to believe the Trinity," &c.? No; you will not "become a fool," and therefore you can never "be wise." Again; "For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war after the flesh: (for the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong-holds;) *casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalleth itself against the knowledge of God*, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. x, 3—5. One specimen of the way in which St. Paul casts down man's "imaginations."\* we have already noticed in the case of a physical difficulty, 1 Cor. xv. 35—38; and that in the case of a moral difficulty will be noticed in a future lecture, Rom. ix. 19, 20. For the present we may observe, that the gospel does not argue with man's imaginations and high thoughts, it makes no compromise with them, it just *casts them down*. He *imagines* that a Trinity is impossible; he *imagines* that a God of love would never do this and the other; but the gospel casts down all such imaginations, and until they are cast down it can never be really embraced. The choice is before you then: will you have your imaginations cast down and accept the gospel,—or let your imaginations stand, and reject the gospel?

The next passage we have to bring forward is a most important one; "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God *as a little child*, he shall not enter therein." Mark x. 15. In the lecture on Original Sin it will be clearly proved, (if proof be required on such a matter,) that our Lord does not mean by this, that no one will be saved, unless he become in this life *absolutely innocent*; all that is necessary for our present purpose is to remind you that he is here speaking of the disposition with which the gospel privileges and blessings, called here as in many other places "the kingdom of God," are to be "*received*,"—namely, in the humble, confiding, teachable, unhesitating spirit of "a little child." A little

\* To prevent any quibbling about "Imaginations" the unlearned reader is informed, that the word in the original is the same which is usually and correctly translated "reasonings."

child believes just what his father tells him, and simply *because* he tells it him; he never doubts or disbelieves because he can't understand the *how* and the *why*: he may ask for an explanation of this or the other, but if it is too high a thing to be explained, or if his father thinks proper not to explain it to him, he doesn't on that account deny it, but he believes that his father has some good reason for concealing it, and that at some future time the difficulty may be removed, and he will be able to understand it. If there can be any doubt as to our Lord's meaning here, his expression in Matt. xviii. 4 must at once remove it; "Whosoever therefore shall *humble himself as this little child*, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." It is true St. Paul tells us not to be "children in understanding,"—but a discerning mind will easily see the consistency of this with our Lord's words; for it is the want of a teachable child-like spirit which prevents our understanding Divine things. Let us try to illustrate the way in which this spirit should be exercised. With regard to physical difficulties, (that is, where we cannot understand *how* such and such a thing can be) the illustration which was used before is quite to the point. You tell a child that the sun never moves, and yet he sees it move apparently every day of his life from one side of the heaven to the other: here are two *revelations* made to him; his own eyesight *reveals* to him that the sun shone on one side of the house in the morning and on the other in the evening; and you *reveal* to him that the sun has never moved during the whole time: can anything appear more perfectly irreconcilable than these two facts? And yet he believes them both; feeling sure that there *is* some way of reconciling them, though he cannot find it out, and his father does not choose at present to tell him. So are we to receive "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." In another world God may clear up to your mind the greatest mysteries, just as easily as you could explain that difficulty to the child, by telling him, that the earth itself turns round.\*

The same kind of reasoning applies also to *moral* diffi-

\* It may be thought perhaps that such an argument as this would justify belief in the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation; that is, the bread and wine being changed into the body and blood of Christ. To this we reply, first, that the expression "This is" so and so, is perpetually used in Scripture to mean "This represents" or "This is like" ("all flesh is grass"): and secondly, that to say Christ's body is ever on the earth now, directly contradicts Scripture, which says, that "the heavens must receive him *until the times of the restitution of all things*,"—which have not yet come. In this case therefore we should be disbelieving the evidence of our senses, not *on*, but *against* the authority of Scripture.

Besides, who cannot see the difference between judging ourselves able to grasp the mysteries of the Infinite Jehovah, and judging ourselves able to tell whether what we have in our mouth is a piece of bread, or flesh and blood? When the Romanist produces "a little child," who, after seeing, feeling, smelling and *eating*, a piece of bread, can be made to believe that it was all the time a piece of flesh-meat, we will give up arguing against Transubstantiation.

culties, (that is, where we cannot see the justice, mercy, or benevolence of some of God's proceedings.) Suppose I tell "a little child," that a man was transported for writing my name on a piece of paper, and that another was executed for going to sleep when he ought to have kept awake, and that in both cases the punishment was only right and just and proper.\* "How very mysterious!" he exclaims, "How could such dreadful punishments be inflicted for such trifling offences? What horribly cruel laws we must live under! What a curse to be born in such a country! surely our government 'deserves to be execrated and denounced,' and 'rebellion must be duty!' Why 'I had rather weep with the weeping, and howl with the howling, and die with the dying, than accept of a favour from such a partial, arbitrary, unreasonable, cruel, and malignant' government. But stop, I'm forgetting; my father told me the punishments were *not* cruel or unjust, but quite necessary; and he must know what is right and wrong better than I do. He told me that it was for the good of the nation the government made such laws, and that it was a great blessing to be an Englishman. I certainly do not see *how* all this can be, but I shall not be so foolish as to set up my judgment against his; I know he would not say so, if it were not true, and therefore I believe it." In the same spirit are we to believe, that whatever God does must be right, whether it *seems* so to us or not. In another world God may justify his ways (if he pleases) even to our minds, quite as easily as these difficulties might afterwards be explained to the child's mind, by teaching him the nature of *forgery*, and showing him the serious consequences that might follow, if a *sentinel* fell asleep at his post in time of war. Let "truth seekers" then cultivate this spirit, for assuredly unless they do, "the things that make for their peace" will be for ever "hid from their eyes." "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto *babes*;† even so Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." Matt. xi. 25. And let us all follow the example of David, who says, "I do not exercise myself in great matters, or in things too high for me: surely I have behaved and quieted myself as a child that is weaned from his mother; my soul is even as a weaned child." Psalm cxxxi. 1. He did not

\* If any one objects, that such punishment is not right, it would be easy to find illustrations not free from the objection. The above were used as plain and simple, and in the argument it must of course be taken for granted that they are proper punishments.

† This text will meet any objections, either from "Be not children in understanding," or from "When I became a man, I put away childish things." We can only become *men* in spiritual knowledge, by receiving each additional truth as it is revealed to us, in the teachable spirit of "*babes*."

doubt or deny anything because it was too high for him, but received it with a simple child-like faith; and instead of *exercising* his mind about it, he restrained the restless workings of his imagination, he made the pride of human reason bow before the word of God, and *quieted himself*.

We might bring forward other passages; but time compels us to conclude the subject. What we have shewn is this—That the Bible itself distinctly professes to reveal things, which, when revealed, will present difficulties beyond the utmost powers of the human intellect to overcome. From which follow two things? first—That any system, which does not contain such difficulties, cannot be the system of the Bible: and, secondly—That no person can possibly receive the system of the Bible, unless he is willing to believe incomprehensible mysteries, and admit the truth of insurmountable difficulties. If then a man tells you, that the great beauty of his religion is its being simple and easy to be understood, and agreeable to human reason, you may be quite certain, without knowing a single doctrine it contains, that it cannot be the religion which God revealed to fallen man. If he tells you, that he will receive no religion, which contains any doctrine that appears to him impossible, irrational, or inconsistent with justice and benevolence, he thereby confesses himself to be an unbeliever, and as long as he remains in that state of mind, he never can become a Christian—he will not “become a fool, that he may be wise,” he “will not receive the kingdom of God as a little child.”

It may be asked, Why has God left these difficulties in his word? Why has he not cleared up all the mysteries, and made it all so plain and simple, that to doubt or mistake would be impossible? We answer in his own words—“It is the glory of God to conceal a thing.” And if you ask further How it is so? we reply—To bring down the pride of man, “that he may take the wise in their own craftiness.” Take a familiar illustration—I tell a child of mine to fetch me something out of a certain room, and to be sure not to go in the dark, but to take a light with him. He pays no attention to this, and thinks he can find the way very well without. On entering the room, he knocks his head violently against a beam, which has been placed across the doorway, and falls back stunned. Who put the beam there? I did. What for? Why on purpose that the child might knock his head against it, if he did not do as I told him, and went without a light; it will teach him for the future to believe that whatever I say and do is the best, whether he can see the reason of it or not. But if he *had* taken a light, it would not have removed the beam, the obstacle would still have been there. Yes; but it would have shown him the necessity of

stooping and creeping under it, and then he would have got through unhurt. So it is with God's word. Ah! are there none here, who have gone to the Bible without taking a light, and stunned themselves? They could find the way very well by themselves; they had no need of the Holy Spirit to enlighten them; their own reason was sufficient to clear up all the mysteries, and remove all the difficulties, and make out a very simple rational plan of salvation—no wonder they stumbled and fell. There are stumbling-blocks in abundance left in God's word, on purpose to test our humility and faith; on purpose to repulse those, who will not seek for the Spirit's guidance, and who will not stoop to believe any thing which they cannot account for, or explain. To them Jesus Christ becomes a stone of stumbling, and a rock of offence, and whosoever shall fall on that stone shall be broken. Try, if you like, to batter down the walls of this church with your naked hand; but don't try the strength of your understanding against the mysteries of God—you can only dash yourself to pieces. *They* cannot be moved, the Rock of Ages can never be shaken, but you may perish in the attempt: "on whomsoever it shall fall, it shall grind him to powder."

But what obstacles do the mysteries of revelation present to the humble Christian, enlightened and directed by the Spirit of God? None whatever. The beam across the doorway is not removed; he does not try to remove it; he does not even wish it removed; he would just as soon it stayed there; and yet it is no obstacle to him at all. Why? Because he is perfectly willing to stoop down and creep under it. There are many difficulties in the Bible, which the Christian cannot explain, many things he is at a loss to reconcile, many objections he is unable to answer: but what of that? Is he shaken by them in his faith? No: God's word warned him of them before-hand, told him to expect them, and he is satisfied with his Master's promise—"What thou knowest not now, thou shalt know hereafter." God says it, and it must be true; God does it, and it must be right. He may not see *how* it can be true, or *how* it can be right; but this he acknowledges to be only his own ignorance, knowing that at present he but "sees through a glass darkly." Thus the very difficulties, by which the proud reasoner is confounded, and the wisdom of this world brought to nought, only serve to exercise and display the faith, the meekness, the humility, of the true Christian, "whose mind, being stayed on God, is kept in perfect peace." This is to receive the kingdom of God as a little child: of *such* (not of persons born innocent) is the kingdom of heaven, and in this way is it "the glory of God to conceal a thing."



A ~~rotary~~ pamphlet has just appeared, in a very different style from either of the three first, and not unnaturally without either writer's or printer's name. It contains an eulogy of Channing, an attack on the interpretation given in our English Bible of Christ's words in Mark iv. 24. "Take heed what ye hear,"—and a little something else, which we must overlook.

With regard to Channing, there cannot be the slightest doubt, that he *did* mean "true believers," orthodox evangelical Christians, though giving his own view of them. The *chief* ground of our love to Christ is set forth by the apostles to be, *Christ's love in dying for us*; but the enlightened, rational, theology of the present day, it seems, despises such childish emotions, and can approve of nothing less dignified than "moral worth." Those who agree with my "Elder Brother" in admiring this *practical* Unitarianism, may no doubt study Carpenter and Channing to advantage. With regard to Mark iv 24., of course I did not mean, that the word "*Blepete*" could *never* signify anything but "beware," but that it could not in the passages quoted—which no one will deny. The wording however of my note to page 17 of lecture I. I am perfectly willing to allow, might certainly lead to the misapprehension; and equally willing to allow, that it would have been better if it had been more courteously worded, though in answer to a not very courteous expression; it is *solely* on this account, that the pamphlet has drawn forth a word of reply. But pray let me remind those who seem so very much afraid of our interpretation of the words, that if we take theirs (Take heed to what ye hear) it cannot mean, that we are to take heed to heresy; for the Holy Ghost had already said by the mouth of Solomon, "Cease my son, from hearing the instruction which causeth to err from the words of knowledge." Is the interpretation of *this* passage objected to?

The writer hints that I may be "possessed." So did the Jews of my master.—He calls my views of prophecy "rhapsody," &c. Not quite seeing the point of the argument, I scarcely know how to meet it. If he will endeavour to show, that they are unscriptural, I shall be happy to give him due consideration, though not to enter on a prophetic controversy.

He concludes by giving me two pieces of advice. The first, "Take heed to thyself," I feel obliged to him for, as I stand continually in need of it, and will endeavour to profit by it, when called upon to answer his or any similar attacks; lest the "old man" should get the better of me, and I

should become "like unto him." Prov. xxvi. 4. If however by calling himself "an old Churchman," "an elder brother," and dating his letter from "Long-sight Rectory," he means to give the impression, that he is a clergyman of the Church of England, or even a Trinitarian at all, I feel compelled "for the credit of my Church" to take the liberty of saying, that I don't believe it. His second piece of advice, not to print the rest of my Lectures, is, I doubt not, given with all sincerity: nay so very anxious does he appear on the subject, that one is almost tempted to suspect—but it is no matter. Their very unexpectedly rapid sale will scarcely allow me to follow his advice in this instance; but one thing I *will* promise—"never, never to print" what I dare not put my name to, or what the printer dare not put his to.

If any of my friends should happen to meet with the production alluded to, let me beg of them not to let their minds be irritated by any such mere personal attacks, as they are really of no consequence whatever. If our opponents cannot overthrow the scripture proofs which are brought forward, never mind what may be said of the advocate; it does not *touch* the question at issue, and can do no possible harm, unless we allow it to engender a similar spirit within our own hearts: let us rather seek for the beautiful spirit of our Litany, which teaches us to pray—

That it may please thee to forgive our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and to turn their hearts,

That it may please thee to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred and are deceived,

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

## LECTURE IV.

### HERESY, BIGOTRY, AND CHARITY.

2 Peter ii. 1, 2. But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their pernicious ways, by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of.

WHAT intolerable bigotry! How illiberal and uncharitable! What a lamentable want of the spirit of Christ! Surely it would have been much better, if Peter had confined himself to expounding the Sermon on the Mount, or the Parables, and enforcing moral duties, instead of "hurling damnation at his fellow creatures," and "consigning people to hell for mistaken opinions." But St. Paul is, if possible, more arrogant still; for he sets up *his own* preaching as the standard which every one is to follow, with the most awful denunciations against any, who should dare to think for themselves, or presume to differ from him in doctrine—"But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal i. 8. And even John, the mild and affectionate John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, and who leant upon his breast at supper, the apostle whose writings speak of nothing but love, actually commands, "If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him\* God speed." 2 John, 10. How refreshing to turn from the bigotry and intolerance of Peter, Paul, and John, to the enlightened liberal sentiments of the present day! "*Our system*"—(I lay stress on the word "*our*" to mark the contrast between it and *the apostles'* system)—"*Our system*," writes Dr. Armstrong, a Unitarian minister in Dublin, "is one of unlimited charity, and Christian love. We do not indeed pretend to say, that it is the only way to heaven: God forbid that we should have such presumption! but we maintain that as a system of peace and charity, it redounds more to the honour of Christ, than any system which engenders animosity and strife. With cheerfulness and cordiality we are ready to clasp the hand of every pious believer in every Church, and to hail him as our Christian brother. And though we think it our duty to vindicate our religious freedom, to set forth firmly our own views

\* I understand this, with most commentators, as referring only to false teachers, persons who came to the place to *propagate* their doctrines. To have afforded accommodation to such would of course have been assisting them in their evil work.

of religious truth; yet believing that every pious, sincere, and upright disciple of every Church and sect is on the path that conducts to eternal life," &c. &c. How perfectly agreeable this is with all the feelings of our nature! How instinctively we sympathise with its loving spirit, and recoil from the stern declarations of the apostles! And no wonder; for our *nature* is fallen, "the *natural* man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God," and "the *carnal* mind is enmity against God." We therefore *naturally* choose the evil and refuse the good." I am sure there is not a person here, who, if he considered the sentiments of Peter or Paul to be of no higher authority than those of Dr. Armstrong, would not reject the former as abominably bigoted, and admire the latter as delightfully charitable. A man must acknowledge the Bible to be the word of God, and his will must be conformed to God's will, before he can feel the falseness, and the danger, of sentiments so congenial to human nature.

This system of "universal charity" is, perhaps more strikingly than any thing else, the very spirit of the age. I believe that very much both in and out of Parliament, that looks like a leaning to Popery, proceeds mainly from the popular infidel notion of all religions being equally right and good. Romanists are thought to have been the most oppressed, and therefore, to make all fair, they must have a little extra favour shown them. Nay, even Popery itself is obliged to swim with the stream, and wear the mask of liberalism. Nearly every one's motto is

For modes of faith let graceless bigots fight,  
His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right.

Let a man only subscribe to this, and no one will find fault with him, whatever he may profess to believe or disbelieve; "all men will speak well of him." This is especially the case with Unitarians; indeed they boast of it, as one of the loveliest features in their system. The most extraordinary instance however of extremes meeting is to be found in two statements of Mr. Barker's on this subject. When writing against a Calvinist in one of his tracts he says, "that bad as infidelity is, there is no form of infidelity with which I am acquainted, so horrible, so unnatural, so utterly infernal and devilish, as this calvinistic theology, which he has hired himself to preach." Now observe, he does not say that a *Calvinist*, who dishonours his Christian profession, is worse than an *Infidel*; but that Calvinistic *theology* is worse than *Infidelity*. Well, you will say, this does not look much like universal charity. But stop; there's something more. Hear what he says, when arguing with Mr. Cooke on the question, What is a Christian? His object now is—not to vilify a particular creed, but—to show that a belief of certain doctrines is not essential to Christianity, and that a man may believe almost anything, and yet be a Christian. He therefore tells us, that

a man "may be a Christian, and yet be a Quaker, a Baptist, a Methodist, a Calvinist." Again, "He may be a Calvinist, a Methodist, a Baptist, a Quaker, a Trinitarian, an Anti-Trinitarian, and have faith in Jesus as the Messiah; and be sincere in heart, and sound in the faith." So that a man may hold doctrines worse than the worst form of Infidelity, and yet be a *Christian*, sincere in heart, and SOUND IN THE FAITH!! Now I should like to know, whether a man who holds such an opinion, is likely to be at all particular about what he believes himself, or to examine his own faith very earnestly and prayerfully. Rely upon it, this is one main cause of a vast deal of the heresy and infidelity around us. People do not believe, that there is any sin in heresy, or at all events that there is such a thing in the world as a "damnable heresy"; they think it's very little matter what a man's creed is, if he only acts up to it; they are quite sure no one will be condemned for not *believing* right, as long as he is *sincere* and *virtuous*; and therefore they are not afraid of listening to all sorts of false teachers; they go to the bible "without the slightest fear of the result," instead of "trembling at God's word," and earnestly seeking the Spirit's guidance, as on a matter of life and death.—Can we wonder at the consequence?

The subject then being so important, let us bring the popular doctrine of sincerity to the test of scripture. We may begin with Prov. xvi. 25. "There is a way that *seemeth right* unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death." Can anything be more plain and positive? But Jesus mentions a particular instance of it; "The time cometh" he tells his disciples "when whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." John xvi. 2. Now here our Lord asserts that the murderers of his saints would act from *sincere* and *upright* motives; but does any one suppose that they were therefore free from blame? Yes, Mr. Barker does! In the noted case of Saul of Tarsus, afterwards Paul the apostle, he actually tells us, that his receiving the apostleship was a *reward* for the sincerity and zeal he displayed in what he thought was the cause of God, when he persecuted Christians unto death!\* But let us see whether Paul himself viewed it in this light. In the first place he says, "I have lived in all good conscience before God unto this day." Now many divines think that he only meant—since his conversion: but the words seem much more naturally to refer to his whole life; and besides, saying that he lived "in all good conscience" was nothing more than saying, he had acted conscientiously; and this is nothing more than what he unquestionably says in another place, "I verily thought that I ought to do many things against Jesus of Nazareth." So far then is clear; Saul *did* act sincerely or conscientiously in his persecutions. And now how does he de-

\* This is in his discussion with Mr. Cooke. I forget the page; but I observed it so particularly, that I am quite sure the above conveys exactly his meaning.

scribe his conduct to Timothy? "And I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained *mercy*, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief. And the grace of our Lord was exceeding abundant, with faith and love which is in Christ Jesus. This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom *I am chief*. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might show forth *all long suffering*, for a pattern to them which should hereafter believe on him to life everlasting." 1 Tim. i. 12—16. The two expressions—"for that he counted me faithful," and "because I did it ignorantly in unbelief," taken alone, might seem to favour Mr. Barker's theory; but such an interpretation of them would be so directly opposed to the whole drift of the passage, that it is absolutely impossible to adopt it. There was something in the character of Saul, which he here describes by the word "faithful," that God saw would make him a valuable apostle, when turned in a right direction. This no doubt was his zeal, perseverance, ardour, and impetuosity: but that there was any *merit* in all this, as he had hitherto used it, we altogether deny, and shall prove it. The simple fact was, that Saul was a man, who would serve faithfully whatever master he followed. He had hitherto served the devil faithfully, and the Lord knew, that when converted he would serve *Him* faithfully. As to the other expression—"because I did it ignorantly in unbelief," there can be little doubt of his meaning. If he had really believed Jesus to be the Messiah, and therefore run to such a length of wickedness *wilfully and knowingly*, it might have amounted to the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost, and so have become impossible for him to "obtain mercy." No one pretends to say, that sin committed in ignorance is *as great* as the same sin committed against light and knowledge: but instead of Saul's conduct commending him to God, and deserving a reward, he represents it as so heinous, that it was only "*because he did it ignorantly in unbelief*" that he was not beyond the pale of mercy altogether. And surely this one word "mercy" is quite enough of itself to overthrow Mr. Barker's theory for ever; for no conduct can *require mercy*, that does not *deserve punishment*. If Saul had deserved a *reward*, what could he want with *mercy*? The two things are flatly contradictory. The sum and substance then of this account of himself is this;—that, although he had throughout acted *conscientiously* and *sincerely*, yet he was "*the chief of sinners*," and his obtaining mercy was a special instance of the long-suffering and exceeding abundant grace of God.

But we shall be reminded of the text, "If our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence towards God." 1 John iii. 21. A most striking instance this, of the necessity of

"comparing spiritual things with spiritual," and the danger of drawing conclusions from single texts without reference to the general testimony of scripture: for St. Paul says, "I know nothing by myself; yet am I *not* hereby justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord." 1 Cor. iv. 4. Every Greek scholar knows that the words, "I know nothing by myself," mean—I am not conscious of anything; that is, he was not conscious of living in any allowed wilful sin; in other words—his heart did not condemn him. "Yet am I *not hereby* justified, but he that judgeth me is the Lord": he had "confidence"—not in himself, not in his own heart, but—"towards God." "The heart" naturally "is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?" Jer. xvii. 9. And therefore "he that trusteth in his own heart *is a fool*." Prov. xxviii. 26. The heart must be changed by converting grace, it must be enlightened and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, before it can give a true verdict. If our heart *then* condemn us not, if notwithstanding all our short comings and infirmities and corruptions, we are conscious of an earnest desire to do God's will, and to be delivered from the bondage of sin, "then have we confidence towards God," we have a satisfactory proof, that we belong to Christ's family, and therefore possess an interest in his atonement.

So far with regard to the general subject of sincerity.—But let us come to the definite question, Is it possible for any one to be condemned, solely for holding *false doctrine*? Hear the teaching of Christ, when he sent forth his apostles; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned." Matt. xvi. 16. Here our Lord solemnly condemns all who do not *believe*—what? Why of course *the* gospel which he sent the apostles to preach. Were the apostles afraid of telling their hearers this? Were they afraid of being called bigoted and presumptuous? Let St. Paul answer; "I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, unto another gospel: which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that ye have received, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. i. 9. There is no affectation here of "universal charity," and enlightened liberalism. Hear also what he says in the 5th chapter of the same Epistle, verse 19; "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, HERESIES, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things *shall not in-*

*herit the kingdom of God.*" St. Peter too, writes in the same way—"There were false prophets among the people, even as there shall be false teachers amongst you, who privily shall bring in *damnable heresies*." 2 Peter ii. 1. Now in answer to this, we are told, that saving faith is simply "believing that Jesus is the Christ," and therefore, as long as a man believes this, he cannot be guilty of a "damnable heresy." When the proper time comes, we shall show, that believing Jesus to be the Christ means—receiving him into our hearts as our anointed Prophet, Priest, and King, in other words, *as our Saviour*, and therefore, that no one can believe it in the scriptural sense, who denies his deity, or rejects his atonement. But to prove that a man may be a professed Christian, and yet in *fatal* error, let me remind you of two sentences of St. Paul's; the first, Gal. v. 2, where speaking of those Christians (not Jews) who wished to make circumcision essential to salvation, he says, "If ye be circumcised, *Christ shall profit you nothing*;" and the second, 2 Tim. ii. 18, where, speaking of Hymenæus and Philetus, he says, "Who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and *overthrow the faith* of some." How uncharitable "to condemn these poor heretics" for a "*mistake*" about circumcision or the resurrection. No doubt they acknowledged in words, that Jesus was the Christ. The passages also quoted before, contain clear proof in themselves, that the writers allude to heresies held by professing Christians within the outward Church. St. Paul speaks of persons who "*perverted the gospel*" and preached "*another gospel*;" while St. Peter foretells us, that "damnable heresies" would be *brought in*, that is evidently into the Church. If we are to believe scripture then, this point must be considered beyond dispute. False doctrine *may* prove fatal to a professing Christian.

But a further question now arises. Is it possible for a Christian to know *what* false doctrine is fatal; in other words, what is "damnable heresy"? And if so, ought he to utter what he knows? Now the first thought that strikes one is, Of what use are these warnings against heresies and false teachers, if it's impossible to tell what is heresy, and who is a false teacher? And if we *do* know them, surely it must be as plain a matter of duty for a pastor to warn his flock against them, as it was for St. Paul pointedly to say, "*Their word will eat as doth a canker; of whom are Hymenæus and Philetus.*" 2 Tim. ii. 17. If any doubt still remains, Paul's command to the *uninspired* bishop of Crete, "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject;" Tit. iii. 10, with John's direction to a private Christian, "if there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds," 1 John ii. 10, must entirely remove it. Many persons really seem to think it presumption in any Christian to be *sure* that what he believes



is the truth; because if I am sure that the gospel I believe is *the* gospel, on the belief of which Jesus made our salvation depend, Matt. xvi. and that the gospel I preach is the gospel Paul preached, Gal. i. 9; I must of course be also sure, that the Unitarian does not believe or preach it. But by the rules of modern charity I am obliged either to acknowledge that two such totally opposite systems as the Unitarian and Trinitarian are *both* the gospel of Christ and his apostles, or to remain in doubt to the day of my death, whether I am not lying under the condemnation of believing and preaching "another gospel." How contrary to the language of St. John, who, after speaking of apostates and antichrists, says, "But ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things. I have not written unto you because ye know not the truth, but because *ye know it*, and that no lie is of the truth." 1 John ii. 20, 21.

In the passage however which we have chosen for our text, St. Peter specifies the particular course that some of the false teachers would take, "even denying the Lord who bought them." And though not a necessary part of our present subject, it is too important to omit noticing, how exactly the two main features of the Unitarian heresy are here described. In the scriptural meaning of the words, they deny both that Jesus is "the Lord," and that he "bought them." This however will be entered into more fully at another time. With respect to the remainder of the passage, can any one, who is acquainted with the course Mr. Barker has pursued, fail to be struck with the words, "who *privily* shall *bring in*"? Or can any one, who is acquainted with his writings, fail to be reminded of the expression, "by reason of whom the way of truth shall be evil spoken of"? Those who have not read his productions, may be rather surprised at the following extract; while those who have, will know that it is only a fair specimen; the capitals are his own; "He says the Trinity has always been connected with the Divine blessing, with rich experience, perfect developement of Christian character, abundant usefulness, and triumphant deaths. Now I ask, with what was it connected during the dark ages? I answer, mystery and abomination went hand in hand. With what is it connected now in Italy, Spain, and South America, &c.; and with what is it connected now in the orthodox sects of Britain and North America? With intolerance, divisions, and persecutions; with priestcraft, tyranny and slavery; with man stealing and slave breeding and slave dealing; with covetousness, oppression, and drunkenness; with lying and slandering; with forging lies and hypocrisy; with robbery and murder; with adultery and fornication; with rapes and sodomy; with bestiality and incest; with wholesale and horrible profligacy, and with all abominations. And the *priests*, the *ADVOCATES* of those mysteries, are the *WORST*, the *MOST* PROFLIGATE, the *MOST* FILTHY, and the *MOST* ABANDONED OF ALL."

Surely St. Peter *must* have been inspired, when he wrote, "by reason of whom, the way of truth shall be evil spoken of"!

"But look at the next verse," our adversaries will say; "and you'll see, that this prophecy cannot apply to us; for it's not our teachers, but *paid ministers*, and *hiring priests*, who 'through covetousness with feigned words make merchandise of you.'" To this I would make a general, and a particular, answer. In the first place it is not at all necessary that every crime mentioned in this chapter should be found in each one of the false teachers foretold, any more than that each individual Romanist should be guilty of all the sins charged against the Church of Rome in the book of Revelations. It is not even, I think, necessary that they should all "deny the Lord that bought them." The apostle warns us of false teachers who would come, and mentions a number of marks, by which they might be known, some probably by one, some by another; and some of whom, at least, would go to the extent of "*even* denying the Lord that bought them." The particular answer about hirelings I must keep for a short lecture by itself. I dare not say that it was "through covetousness"; but giving Mr. Barker credit for the best possible motive, it was certainly doing evil, that good might come, to use "feigned words," in order to escape being expelled from a religious body, whose *pay* he received as long as he could get it. His outcry now against paid ministers reminds me of our excellent and zealous friends of the Free Church in Scotland, who suddenly discovered that all establishments were wrong, when they could remain no longer in their own.

One other point remains to be noticed, namely, the virtuous exemplary lives of many Unitarians. Is it not written, "By their fruits ye shall know them"? True: and what kind of fruit is heresy? Is it one of "the fruits of the Spirit"? No; St. Paul classes it amongst "the works of *the flesh*," and declares, "that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God."\* Again, what kind of fruit is self righteousness, sabbath breaking, taking from God's word, "speaking evil of dignities"? A man's conduct may look fair to the world, but it is only a spiritual mind, that can truly discern, what are, and what are not, "fruits of the Spirit." The young ruler possessed such an amiable disposition, and such a high moral character, that Jesus, having the feelings of a man, "loved him"; but when brought to the test, he failed. So an avowed infidel may have such winning qualities, that our affections are irresistibly drawn towards him; but we are not deceived into supposing them to be genuine fruits of the Spirit. "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light: therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the

\* The writer of a tract lately published quotes, "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of him"; and asks, "Does Mr. M. find here no gleam of hope? If not, 'tis grief and pity." I wish I could, but—Heresy is not "righteousness."

ministers of righteousness." 2 Cor. xi. 14; though it does not at all follow, that there must always be intentional hypocrisy. You must remember that the devil is a practised veteran at his own warfare; and he knows well how to suit his temptations to each particular person. He has various perversions and imitations of the gospel, and he cares not in which net his victims are caught. Let us take two opposite cases, and see how he acts in each of them. One man is addicted to certain vices, which he is unwilling to give up. Well, so far it is all right, the victim is safe. But he wants something to ease his conscience; he wants a religion, that will let him keep on sinning, and yet hold out a hope of pardon. Satan has a perversion of the gospel ready for him. He makes him rest in a *dead* faith, a faith that produces no fruits, what St. James calls "faith without works." He persuades him that, so long as he trusts to being saved by Christ, he may live in whatever sin he pleases. Now this answers a double purpose. It keeps the individual sinner under satan's power, and it throws discredit on the doctrine of the atonement; it enables the adversary to cry out, See the effects of trusting to Christ's blood for salvation. But now take another case. Here is a man not in slavery to gross vices, but of good moral character. Well, the devil knows that, as long as he builds his hopes of salvation on his own righteousness, he is as far from heaven as the open profligate. What is his plan therefore? Is it to lead him into sin? Not at all; rather to keep him out of temptation, to assist him in his upright moral conduct; for the more upright he is, the less likely is he to feel any qualms about the soundness of the foundation on which he builds. Far from wishing to stir up the corruptions within his heart, or to harass him with temptations, which might shake him out of his self-confidence, the great enemy of souls would keep him as close as possible to "the form of godliness," and adorn his character with every outward grace; while the true believer, whose foot is planted on the rock of ages, he would harass and assault with all his might. "We are not ignorant of his devices."

On the whole then it is very evident, that when our Lord said, "Judge not, and ye shall not be judged, condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned," Matt. vii. 1, he could not mean what many persons seem to imagine, namely, that a Christian has no means of knowing what is heresy, and what is not; or, at least, if he does know, that he ought not to utter his sentiments. Indeed, his words on another occasion might show us this; "Judge not according to the appearance, but judge righteous judgment." John vii. 24. We are told to "compare spiritual things with spiritual," and by so doing only shall we learn "the mind of the Spirit." The rule of conduct our Lord here lays down is perfectly plain and simple; only it is necessary that we should join with it other directions equally binding, in order that we may make no mistake in *applying* the rule. His meaning of course is, that we are

always to put the best possible construction on the conduct of another; not to indulge a suspicious or censorious disposition; always to consider a man innocent, until he is proved guilty; and even if he does what we disapprove of, not to be eager in condemning him, but to make all the allowances for him we can, remembering our own infirmities and imperfections; never to impute bad motives and intentions to a person, where it is possible to give him credit for good ones: in short, to pay particular attention to the worst side of our own character, and the best of every one else's. This is true scripture charity; that charity or love, without which all else is nothing; without which the highest gifts and the most splendid acquirements are but as "sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal;" that charity, which "suffereth long and is kind," which "envieth not, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh not evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things:" that charity, which is briefly comprehended in this saying, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And can I love my neighbour, without wishing to save his soul? Impossible. "Charity to the soul is the soul of charity." Which shews the most real charity to his neighbour; the man, who is bigotted enough to tell him of his danger, and try to pull him back, even though it be with a rude shake; or the man, who dare not be so dogmatical, so arrogant and presumptuous, as to tell him that destruction is before him, and therefore bows him politely to the edge of the precipice? Vehement rebuke and stern denunciation are no less called for from the minister of Christ, than gentle persuasion and affectionate entreaty; and the one may proceed from a spirit of love just as much as the other. St. Jude tells us that some cases require different treatment from others; and that we are to endeavour to distinguish between them: "Of some," he says, "have compassion, making a difference; and others save with fear, pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." Now the Romanist and Socinian run into two opposite, and equally unscriptural, extremes. The one declaring that there is no salvation out of his own church; the other, that there is salvation in any mode of faith whatever, if a man be only sincere and virtuous. The latter is certainly more pleasing and agreeable to human nature; but I question very much whether it is not the more dangerous error of the two; and how flatly contradictory to the word of God, you have already heard enough to be able to judge. You will no longer, I hope, be frightened by the world's war-cry of bigotry and intolerance, or be deceived by its professions of universal charity; but remember, that true scriptural charity "*believeth all things,*" "*rejoiceth in the truth,*" and is more anxious to save a brother's soul, than to gain his favour by saying, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace."

## LECTURE V.

### ON HUMAN TEACHING.

Acts viii. 30, 31. Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I, except some man should guide me?

THE subject of human teaching is rather a delicate one to touch upon, as we have the Romish Priest on one side of us, and the Unitarian on the other, the scriptural path between the two being very narrow. The Romanist practically does away with the necessity of searching the scriptures, by demanding a blind submission to the teaching of *the Church* (as he calls it); while the Unitarian makes a boast of despising all human creeds and human teachers, and thinks he justifies himself for so doing by declaiming against priestcraft and spiritual despotism, mental thralldom, &c., &c. Our present business, however, is only with the latter, though a few words may be necessary just to guard against the opposite danger.

No one can have read much of Mr. Barker's writings, without seeing that the real object of his outcry against *paid* ministers is to throw discredit on the Christian ministry altogether. *He knows*, as well as I do, that a minister may receive pay, and yet not be what our Lord calls a "hireling;" but he knows also, that calling them all hirelings together lowers them in the eyes of ignorant people, and so far weakens their influence. If he can only get people to shut their ears against the ministers of Christ, on the ground that they are paid for teaching certain doctrines, and therefore are not worth attending to, he will then be able to instil his own teaching into their minds, with little danger of having his mistakes corrected or his deceptions exposed. To accomplish this end he spares no pains, and is not afraid of using such wholesale calumny, as I have given a specimen of in the preceding Lecture. Let us then briefly prove from scripture, First, that the Christian ministry is a thing ordained by God; and, Secondly, that a *paid* ministry is a thing sanctioned by God.

1 Cor. xii. 23, 29. "And *God hath set* some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly *Teachers*, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues. Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are

all Teachers?" Yes, to be sure, we are; every man is his own teacher: "The people have been too long held in bondage by an interested and money-loving priesthood; but their eyes are getting opened, and they are now determined to think and act for themselves." No doubt they are; it is one of the most striking signs of the times. But let me beg you to consider, whether, when God set teachers in the church, he thought every one capable of teaching himself; and whether those, who despise one of the divinely appointed means of learning the truth, are ever likely to be taught it. If it be replied, that these "teachers were only required in the early days of Christianity, we refer you to Eph. iv. 11, 13, where both their purpose and duration are fixed. "And he gave some apostles; and some prophets; and some evangelists; and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of *the ministry*, for the edifying of the body of Christ; *till we all* come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." No one, I suppose, will say, that this state of universal Christian perfection has yet arrived; and if not, "the ministry" is still a Divine ordinance. Again, "We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are *over* you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." 1 Thes. v. 12. Who talks of any one being over us? Such language "might have been expected from a Roman Catholic Priest, and in a Popish country, but it won't suit the present age and country." Quite true, it will not indeed; but it is the language of an inspired Apostle notwithstanding; and language which he used more than once. Hear him again; "Let the elders which *rule* well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." 1 Tim. v. 17. "Remember them which have the *rule over you*, who have spoken unto you the word of God; *whose faith follow*, considering the end of their conversation, Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." Heb. xiii. 7. And lastly, "Obey them that have the rule over you, and *submit yourselves*: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account." Heb. xiii. 17. From these texts we might have learnt for ourselves, even if another Apostle had not told us, (Jude ii), that it is quite possible, under the Christian dispensation, where there is no *Priest*\* to commit the sin, in spirit at least, of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram—"And they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy every one of them, and

\* The only Priesthood now is the High-priesthood of Christ, and the universal Priesthood of Christians, 1 Pet. ii. 9. The word "Priest" in our Prayerbook is a contraction of Presbyter, which means an elder. The Church of Rome does claim to have Priests, that is, persons appointed to *offer sacrifice*.

the Lord is among them : wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord ? Numbers, xvi. 3. If some professedly Christian ministers, alas ! “ Run greedily after the error of Balaam for a reward,” are none of the people in danger of perishing in *the gainsaying of Core ?* ”

You will now, it is to be hoped, see through the fallacy of the Unitarians' favourite question, which is boasted of as “ un-answered and unanswerable ”—If you had never seen any religious book but the Bible, and had no other opportunity of gaining religious information, would you have known anything of orthodox doctrines ? Let us put another question ; If the Eunuch had had no other opportunity of gaining religious information but the Bible which he was reading in his chariot, would he have understood the 53rd chapter of Isaiah ? If so, why was Philip sent to explain it to him, and what did he mean by replying to Philip's question, whether he understood what he read, How can I, except some man should guide me ? God never intended the Bible to be our only opportunity of gaining religious information ; he never intended, that when the Bible was put into our hands we should be left without any human help or teaching, to learn the truth out of it by ourselves ; he never intended that our minds should be left *unprejudiced*, to form our own religious opinions ; in other words, that we should grow up from childhood without any religious instruction. No, besides the knowledge of Divine truth, which every child should receive from its parent with the first dawn of intellect, God has given us “ evangelists, pastors, and teachers ; ” this shews that he does *not* mean us to be left to ourselves, but to be *taught, guided, and instructed*. It is true that all may not have this privilege ; and whether a person, who really had no other means but the Bible of gaining religious information, would attain to a saving knowledge of the truth, depends entirely upon whether he had been given a sincere desire to know and do God's will. The Holy Spirit can open a sinner's eyes and shew him the way of salvation without, just as easily as with, a human teacher ; for we contend resolutely against the Romanist, that all necessary truth is *contained in*, and may be *proved by*, holy scripture ; that we are to receive no doctrine on the authority of any man or set of men whatever, unless they can give us full proof for it out of the Bible ; that it is our duty to follow the example of the Bereans, who “ searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so ; ” and that the Bible, being the only *authoritative and infallible* rule of faith and practice, should be in the hands of every Christian, that the word of man may be tested by the word of God. On the other hand, we contend as resolutely against the Unitarian, that, while the Bible professes to contain all saving truth, it bids us seek the assistance of teachers to help us to a right understanding of it ; and that they, who in the proud self-confidence of their hearts despise

the means God has appointed, are not likely to be guided from above, or attain to the truth as it is in Jesus.

Having thus seen the scriptural ground on which the christian ministry rests, let us now look at the means by which Mr. Barker tries to throw discredit on it. In the first place, he *condemns* its ministers in a body as "the worst, the most filthy, the most abandoned of all." Whether the worst of all those ministers of religion, who alas! may have "held *the truth in unrighteousness*," ever provoked God more fearfully than the writer of the above passage did, when he bore that and such like false witness against the servants of Christ, the day of judgment alone will shew. The charge, however, even if true, would not touch the question, as our Lord's command to the Jews clearly proves: "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's seat; all therefore, whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do;\* but do not ye after their works, for they say and do not." Matt. xxiii. 2. The teacher's ungodliness cannot make truth to be falsehood; we are not to disbelieve his doctrine, if proved from scripture, because his life does not adorn it. The favourite weapon however of this "accuser of the brethren" is calling us hirelings, and charging us with teaching things we ought not for filthy lucre's sake. Now this deserves rather a closer examination, because it contains a fallacy not perhaps seen through at once by minds unused to thinking, but which I fear such a mind as his *must* see through. I only wish I could believe that he does not *know* what a gross deception he is practising upon the ignorant, when he applies the name of hirelings to all paid ministers. The deception is this. The word hireling is used in two senses. The first means a person who receives pay for any kind of service done by him: in this sense, scripture, as we shall presently shew, sanctions a Christian minister being a hireling; that is, sanctions his being supported by others, in order that he may devote himself exclusively to the work of the ministry. The second sense is that in which our Lord uses the word, meaning a person who cares nothing for the work he is engaged in, and does it *only because* he is paid for it. Now Mr. Barker tries to confound these together, and to throw the odium of being a hireling in the latter sense upon every minister, who is a hireling in the former sense. Our Lord says, that "the hireling careth not for the sheep:" if therefore a minister does care for the sheep, he cannot be a hireling in Christ's sense of the term; and will any one dare to say that not one of all the paid ministers, who ever

\* There must have been some limit *implied* to this command, because the Scribes bid the people reject Jesus as the Messiah, and he could not have meant them to follow their teachers in this. Whatever their authorised teachers taught them *out of the law*, they were to obey; but when they taught them anything *contrary to the law*, the final standard of appeal was open to them, and they must, of course, obey God rather than man. The same limit is also implied in all those passages, where Christians are told to obey their "pastors and teachers," "Not for that we have *dominion* over your faith, but are *helpers of your joy*." 2 Cor. i. 24.



lived, cared for the sheep? If there is, or ever was, such a case, it proves of course that a minister may receive pay, and yet not be a hireling. But we need have no ifs in the matter; for scripture is quite positive on the point. When sending out the twelve to preach, Jesus bids them, "provide neither silver, nor gold, nor brass in your purses, nor scrip for your journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves, *for the workman is worthy of his meat.*" Matt x. 10. When sending out the seventy he gives similar directions: "And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give; *for the labourer is worthy of his hire.*" Luke x. 7. And St. Paul devotes half a chapter (1 Cor. ix.) to arguing out the question, and proving that he, as well as all other preachers, had a right to be supported by those to whom they preached; although from the peculiar circumstances of the case he thought it better to forego his right at that time; "Even so *hath the Lord ordained*, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." Whatever then may be Mr. Barker's opinion of a paid ministry, Paul's opinion is clear enough—that it was *ordained by the Lord*; and this is sufficient for any Christian.

That there *are* hirelings in the ministry, no one, alas! can deny; but it cannot be the simple fact of receiving hire, that makes them so; for Jesus says "the labourer is worthy of his hire." Everything depends on the *motive*—"the hireling careth not for the sheep." Take two ministers, in the same church: they both believe its doctrines and approve of its discipline; they receive the same amount of pay, and do the same amount of work; and yet one of these may be a hireling, and the other not. What makes the difference? Their motives—One "cares not for the sheep," has no love to his work, and would not do it at all, if he were not paid for it; he does it *for the sake of* the pay, and therefore he is a "hireling." The other does love his work, does care for the sheep, and only receives the pay, that he may "give himself wholly" to their service. Will any one dare to say, that he is a hireling in the bad sense of the term? Here is a man, who is willing to devote his whole time to the work of the ministry, but cannot do so, because he has not the means to live without working. A number of persons, forming a Christian Church, come forward and say to him, Well, we will provide you with a maintenance, as long as you choose to "do the work of an evangelist;" while we "reap your spiritual things," you shall "reap our temporal things." Pray, what's the harm of this? Why even if scripture had not said a word on the subject, common sense would have been sufficient of itself to decide such a question. But there is one circumstance, it may be thought, makes a man a hireling, namely, when he receives pay on condition of preaching particular doctrines, which if he did not preach, his pay would be withheld. I answer, If he preaches doctrines he does not believe *for the sake of* the pay, he is a hireling; but if he does believe what

he is required to preach, he is no such thing. And as to the other part of the objection, would it be right for any church to continue supporting a minister who preached false doctrine? An inspired apostle has decided; "A man that is an heretic," much more a minister, "after the first and second admonition, reject." Tit. iii. 10. Again, it may be objected, that many ministers receive a much larger stipend than is necessary for their proper maintenance. This has nothing to do with the question. Whatever his income may be, if he is a man of God, he will spend it to God's glory; but *the amount* cannot affect the question of his being a hireling or not. It all depends, as we said before, on the motive. If he works for the sake of the pay only, he is a hireling, let the pay be ever so small; if not, he cannot be one, let it be ever so large. The gross and scandalous *abuses* in the system we don't for a moment defend, and Mr. Barker may lash at them to his heart's content. But he does not confine himself to them, he attacks the system itself, that system which St. Paul declares to have been *ordained of God*. We must beware of "rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing," but really, when we see a man taking upon himself to *judge* nearly the whole body of Christian Ministers, and in the most scurrilous language *condemning* them as a set of hirelings, and then talking about *charity*—it is not very easy to exercise the forbearance of Michael the archangel, who "durst not bring a railing accusation against" his adversary, no! not in the heat of dispute, but said, "The Lord rebuke thee." Jude 9.

## LECTURE VI.

### ON THE FALLEN NATURE OF MAN.

That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again. John iii. 6, 7.

IN this conversation with Nicodemus, our Lord instructs him in the three grand doctrines of the gospel, which Bertridg used to call the three R's,—ruin, redemption, regeneration. Man's ruin is twofold, internal and external; and the gospel provides a twofold remedy to meet it. He has exposed himself to the curse of God's righteous law, and a remedy is provided in "the redemption which is in Christ Jesus": he has also lost the image of God, after which he was "created in righteousness and ~~true~~ holiness," and a remedy is provided in the regeneration or new birth of the Holy Spirit. Now the first thing to observe is, that Christ here insists on the necessity of *every* man being born again, before he can see the kingdom of God; "except *a* man" being of course equal to except any or every man: and the next is, the grounds on which he rests that necessity. Nicodemus being surprised at what he had just heard about the new birth, Jesus explains it to him more fully, and shows him *why* it was so universally necessary: "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." By referring to Gal. v. 17—23, you will see at once the meaning of the word *flesh*, when thus contrasted with the Spirit, namely, the evil principle which is inherent in our nature; and this is the only meaning that will make any sense of our Lord's argument. As every man receives *at his birth* the corrupt, fallen, fleshly nature of his parents, it is perfectly clear, that he must receive a new nature somehow or other, before he can enter the kingdom of heaven. This new nature, our Lord says, is given by

the Holy Spirit, and the receiving of it he calls "being born again." Would any one have believed it possible, that a body of men, acknowledging these to be the words of a teacher sent from God, could yet deny the doctrine of original sin? Or that a person like Mr. Barker, who surely must have read this chapter, could have the hardihood to assert, that "Jesus Christ says not one word of any such thing"? Another meaning *may* be forced upon the words, for aught I know; but that any one, who was simply willing to learn what Jesus intended to teach by them, could mistake their meaning, I really cannot believe. The whole argument (proving that no one can enter heaven without being born again, because every one *being born* of the flesh is flesh,) is so perfectly clear, that our Lord may well say, "Marvel not, that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." If Unitarians would only believe what Jesus here teaches about man's fallen nature, they would no longer marvel at, or endeavour to explain away, what he also teaches about the necessity of a new birth.

And now, before we bring other scriptural evidence to prove this doctrine, let us examine the arguments and objections, on the strength of which the positive testimony of Christ is thus flatly rejected. In the first place then we are told in no very measured language, that it is most horrible blasphemy to accuse God of creating any thing wicked or sinful.\* So it is; but who ever did accuse him of it? No one denies, that whatever comes from the hands of God must be perfectly good. But do Unitarians suppose, that every child born into the world comes fresh from the hands of God? If they do, both reason and scripture contradict them. Look at yon oak tree, and tell me *when* God created it. Was it when it first began to sprout out of the ground? No, it was contained in the acorn before that. Was it when that acorn was formed? No, for it grew gradually on another tree; it was part of that tree. Then when did God create it? Why when he created the first oak tree in the world: *in that one* he created all that have ever grown from it. And now trace back your own existence day by day and hour by hour, and say *when* God created *you*. There is but one answer can be given; he created you, when he made the first man in the world: *in that man*, Adam, all the human race were created. God does not create each child

\* Mr. Barker appeals to parents, and asks, If you had the making of your own children, would *you* make them with wicked hearts? The scriptural answer to this is given above; God made them upright, but they fell from that uprightness, being in the loins of their father Adam (to borrow the apostle's expression,) when he sinned. But just to shew the absurdity of that kind of argument, let us ask another question; If you had the making of your children, would you make them sickly, diseased, deformed, blind, deaf, or dumb? Then you are making God worse than yourself; for children *are* born so continually. See Lecture on Human Reason.

separately and singly, any more than he creates each tree separately and singly. Adam was made a wonderful being, having power and properties within him capable of propagating his own species to an infinite extent; so that the whole human race is but a developement of that one man. This principle applies to the whole animal and vegetable world; they were all made to "increase and multiply and replenish the earth", each with his own species. It is a universal law of creation, that like produces like; all the trees that ever came from the first oak, are oaks themselves; all the animals that have ever come from the first sheep are sheep themselves, and so on: whether beast, bird, fish, or tree, the parent can only produce a child *in its own image*. Now suppose, after God had made the first oak tree, some one could have gone and turned it into an ash tree, what would have been the consequence? Why all the trees that came from it would have been ash trees also. Would it then have been said, that God made them ash trees? Or, if there was any blame in the matter, would it be his fault that they were so? Certainly not; he made them, but he made them *oaks*—not what they now are. So it is with our fallen nature. God created us all holy *in Adam*; but Adam fell; his nature was changed, he lost the image of God in which he was made, and "in Adam all died": the oak is turned into an ash, and by the laws of creation every one that comes from it must be the same. Adam having lost the image of God himself, could no more bring forth a child in the image of God, than a bramble could bear figs, or a vulture breed a dove. He could only hand down to his children, and his children to their children, and so on, the same corrupt fallen nature, which he had himself. And is God to blame for all this? Certainly not; he made man, but he made him *holy*—not what he is now: man is fallen from that state of perfection, in which he came from the hands of God.

If any still feel inclined to look upon the birth of each individual child as a separate act of creation, I would direct their attention to the following passages of scripture. "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work, which God created and made." Gen. ii. 3. The works of *creation* are here represented as finished, as far as this world is concerned. Again, why should God bid man "be fruitful and multiply, and replenish the earth," if every human being was to come into the world simply by an act of God's creative power? Observe also the expression in Eccl. vii. 29, "God hath made man upright, but they have found out many inventions;" not *does make*, but *hath made*—once for all. St. Paul too speaks most distinctly on this point, saying that Levi paid tithes to Melchisedec,

"for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him," Heb. vii. 10. The apostle here actually builds an argument on the fact of something done by Levi's ancestor Abraham being considered as done by him, because he was *in Abraham* at the time. Then of course, by the same reasoning, we must have all been in Adam when he was created, and in Adam when he fell; a truth which the same apostle elsewhere states plainly—"In Adam all died."

Another objection brought against this doctrine is, that it destroys man's responsibility. Various answers might be given to this, as for instance, that the Spirit's help is promised to all who ask for it, to overcome the corrupt inclinations of the heart; but I prefer keeping to the inspired answer, which St. Paul gave, when the same objection was brought against another doctrine, "Nay, but O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" Rom. ix. 20. God tells us in his word, that we *are* responsible creatures, although born in sin; and if we refuse to believe him, because we cannot reconcile the two things together, we do it at our peril. Every true believer knows and feels, that he is responsible for his actions, as certainly as he knows and feels that he "was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did his mother conceive" him.

The same answer will suffice for all cavils about the injustice of children suffering for the sins of their parents. Our first parent's act was our act, just as much as Abraham paying tithes to Melchisedec was Levi's act, "for we were yet in the loins of our father," when he ate the forbidden fruit. Besides, let us appeal to fact: Do not children inherit the curse of their parents' misconduct? Why we see it every day of our lives. A man ruins his health by a vicious depraved life, and the consequence is, he begets a child with a weak sickly constitution. Another squanders away all his money in extravagance and debauchery, and his children are left beggars. A third is transported for felony, and his family have to go to the workhouse. Is it not a universal law of nature, which unquestionable facts are ever proving, that children must and do suffer for the sins of their parents? No one in his senses can deny it. Let us beware of replying against God, because we cannot see the justice or goodness of all he does: let us remember, that "we now see through a glass darkly," and that "it is the glory of God to conceal a thing" in order to try our humility, and faith, and dependence on his simple word.\*

\* It may be asked, Why are not the children of regenerate parents born regenerate? To which we reply, *Spiritual* Regeneration can not be communicated by natural generation. The father can only give by generation to his children the nature which he received by generation from *his* father—not the nature which he received by regeneration from the Holy Spirit.

What appears however at first sight a more serious argument against the doctrine of original sin is drawn from the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the apostle Paul, in reference to children. It will be most convenient to consider St. Paul's expression the first; "Brethren, be not children in understanding; howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men." 1 Cor. xii. 20. Now if this proves that children are born without malice, it must also prove that they are born without understanding—which is not the fact. What is understanding but the exercise of the brain? And are children born without any brains? No; a child's brain is as perfect as a man's; the only difference is, that the powers of one are more developed and strengthened by exercise than the other. A new-born infant has the *principle* of understanding as much as a grown-up person, but it is so slightly drawn out into practice, as to be scarcely perceptible; it lies dormant. Therefore since the apostle here places children on the same footing as regards malice and understanding, we should naturally conclude, that, as they are born with the principle or seeds of understanding, that is with brains, so they are born with the principle or seeds of malice, that is a corrupt heart, "for out of the heart proceed evil thoughts," &c., &c. And now observe how properly the emblem of a child is here used to describe the Christian's freedom from malice—"in malice be ye children." Does a Christian ever attain a state of perfect absolute innocence in this life? Let St. John answer; "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." 1 John i. 8. St. Paul too argues at large in the 7th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, that the principle of sin continues in us, and has to be struggled against all our lives. The standard we have to aim at is the perfection and holiness of God; but if we say we have reached it, "we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." Well then may the apostle exhort Christians, "In malice be ye children; for in both cases the seeds of malice, as well as every other kind of evil, lie concealed in the heart, while in both cases its actings are suppressed; the propensities of the child not yet being developed, those of the Christian being subdued by the power of Divine grace. A new-born infant is as fit an emblem of innocence, as a new-born tiger is of gentleness and harmlessness. Look at it; how quiet and peaceable it is! Why it would not hurt a child. "Instead of thinking that tigers are born with ferocious and cruel natures," Mr. Barker would argue, "we wish every one was as innocent and harmless." So do we; but tigers are born with ferocious and cruel natures notwithstanding. Give it time and opportunity to *shew* its nature, to *develop* its propensities, and you will soon see what this quiet and gentle

looking animal will turn out: yet at present we might say to a person with perfect propriety, You should endeavour to be as gentle and harmless as this young tiger; in the same way that the apostle exhorts, "In malice be ye children." The same principle applies to all kinds of animals, who are born, as is well known, each with their own peculiar propensities; which propensities however very few of them display or carry out into action at first. The vegetable world also will furnish us with illustrations no less appropriate. Take two rose seeds; plant them in the same soil, at the same time, close together, so that they must be exposed to the same temperature, the same sun, and the same rain. They both grow up trees, and both trees bear roses; but the roses on one tree have a sweet scent, those on the other have no scent, or scarcely any. What makes the difference? Evidently the seed; it can be nothing else. The two seeds must have been of different kinds; yet if you had smelled them, you would have perceived no more smell in the one than the other, and of either of them you might have said, that such and such a thing was as scentless as this rose seed. It *gives out* no perceptible smell at present; but it contains that within itself, which, if allowed time and proper circumstances for development, will infallibly produce a sweet-scented rose. Again, look at this young sapling just sprouting up from the ground; how tender and soft and pliable it is, a fit emblem at present of any thing that is easily bent or twisted. But give it time to grow and shew its real nature, and it will become a knotted oak, hard, firm and unbending. Nay, the germ of all that is seen in the full grown tree, was contained in the very acorn from which it grew; though the acorn shewed as little signs of it, as an infant does of the fallen nature he possesses. Such illustrations might of course be multiplied without end, all shewing the propriety of the apostle's exhortation, and its perfect agreement with the scriptural doctrine of original sin, "Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men."

We now come to the two expressions of our Lord's, on which so much stress is laid. The first is found in Matt xviii. 2, 3. "And Jesus called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Now if a little child is absolutely sinless and holy by nature, then no one can enter heaven, whose nature has not become absolutely sinless and holy in this life; for the becoming as little children is not said to take place after entering heaven, but is insisted on as a necessary qualification before entering it. Had St. John attained this state of *perfect innocence*, when he said, "If



we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us"? Or St. Paul, when he wrote the 7th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans? Would any one dare to say he had attained it? If he did, it would indeed shew him to be in a state of the most utter spiritual blindness, ignorant alike of the nature of sin, and of the state of his own heart. Our Lord's meaning is seen plainly from the context, especially when compared with the account of the same story given by St. Mark, ch. ix. 33, and by St. Luke, ch. ix. 46. The disciples had shown a proud ambitious spirit, by disputing among themselves who should be the greatest; in answer to which Jesus uses the words in question, and adds, "*Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.*" The child is set before them evidently as a pattern of humility; but this no more proves a child's nature to be sinless, than St. Paul's saying "In malice be ye children." The seeds of pride as well as of malice are in its nature, and so they are in the most advanced Christian's nature (see Rom. ch. vii); but in the one they have not yet been able to develop themselves, in the other they are subdued by Divine grace. A little child then, although born in a fallen nature, is as fit an emblem of one, who in the Lord's strength overcomes the pride of his heart, as of one who overcomes the malice of his heart.

The other passage is in Matt. xix. 14. "And Jesus said, suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Heaven is not made up of wicked persons, it is argued, and therefore children cannot have wicked hearts. Now in the first place let us ask, "If these children, whatever their age might be, were not sinners in some way, and consequently in need of a Saviour, why were they brought to Jesus "that he should put his hands on them and pray"? Would not the disciples have been right in rebuking their parents? And would not Jesus instead of saying, "Suffer them to come unto me," have said, Take them away, they are sinless and don't want a Saviour; I have nothing to do with such innocent creatures; the *whole* have no need of a physician, but they that are *sick*; the Son of Man is come to save that which was *lost*; I am not come to call the *righteous*, but *sinners* to repentance; I am *not sent*, but unto the *lost* sheep of the house of Israel; and little children are neither sick nor lost; don't bring them to me." Such would undoubtedly have been his language, if children were what Unitarians assert; and the welcome he gave them is as plain a proof as can be required, that they *were* sinners, and therefore that the Unitarian interpretation of the words, "Of such is the kingdom," cannot possibly be a correct one. If heaven is inhabited by *such* beings as those children then were, what

need of their being brought to Jesus at all? They must have been quite fit for heaven already; what more could be wanted? The very argument carries its own answer on the face of it. Still the question remains, What *did* Jesus mean by it? Now there are two interpretations usually given of the words, both of which I will lay before you. The first supposes them to refer to infant baptism. In order to understand this, you must remember that "the kingdom of heaven," or "the kingdom of God," (which is the same thing) very often in St. Matthew's gospel means the Christian dispensation, the outward and visible Church upon earth, not in heaven, especially in reference to the character, condition, and privileges of its members. It is perhaps more generally used to denote the millennial reign of Christ on the earth; but it certainly is, and that not unfrequently, also applied to the *preparatory* or *intermediate* dispensation, during which Christ is gathering out his Bride, the elect Church, which is to share the glory of his kingdom. Witness the following passages. After hearing the parable of the sower, which evidently refers to the kingdom of grace on earth, not glory in heaven, "the disciples came, and said unto him, Why speakest thou unto them in parables? He answered and said unto them, Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given." Matt. xiii. 10, 11. The promise to Peter, Matt. xvi. 19, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," no doubt refers to his being the chosen instrument of opening the doors of the Christian Church to the whole Gentile world, and admitting them to the privileges of the gospel. Acts x. and xi. Again, "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you." Matt. xii. 28. "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matt. xxi. 43. "Beloved, the kingdom of God is within you." Luke xvii. 21. Such then being the constant use of the expression "kingdom of heaven" or "kingdom of God," there is no difficulty at all in supposing our Lord's meaning to be, that, as under the Jewish dispensation infants were admitted into the outward Church, so they would continue to be under the Christian dispensation: nor do I think it any objection to this view, that he says nothing concerning the change which was afterwards made in the rite, when baptism took the place of circumcision. Infants were still to be, as they always had been, received into outward covenant with God, and therefore let no one "forbid them" to be brought to Jesus for his blessing. But there is another interpretation which the words will bear equally well, and which agrees better with what immediately follows.\* For

\* See Mark x. 15, and Luke xviii. 15.

both Mark and Luke, in their account of the story, relate that, after saying "For of such is the kingdom of God," our Lord added, "Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not *receive* the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein." From this, the meaning of the disputed words would appear to be, that all members of "the kingdom of heaven," or the Christian Church, ought to have, and that all true members would have, *such* a teachable, humble, gentle disposition, as those little children: which agrees with what he himself had said just before, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and with what St. Paul said afterwards, "In malice be ye children." These are the two views taken of the passage: the first seems better to suit what goes before, the second what comes after, while neither of them are at all inconsistent with the doctrine of original sin. I have little doubt myself, that our Lord intended his words to bear this double meaning, and consequently, that both the interpretations are correct; that he meant one of the two things I have no doubt whatever; that he could not possibly mean what the Unitarian would make out is perfectly demonstrable. And yet on the strength of this text with the two others already noticed, Mr. Barker throws overboard the whole body of scriptural evidence to prove the depravity of human nature. So conscious does he appear of the impossibility of fairly meeting it, that he is driven to the following summary method of disposing of it. He first forces a meaning of his own upon two expressions of our Lord's and one of St. Paul's, *which not one of the three will bear*, and then says, "that if any passage really contradict this doctrine of the purity and sinlessness of little children, that passage must be a falsehood or a forgery." I ought perhaps to say that he adds, "no passage in the Bible does contradict this doctrine"; but he does not "enter upon an examination of those passages which are supposed to contradict it," though he "may do so at a future period." Whether the period ever arrived I know not; but I think even *his* ingenuity would be rather severely taxed, to explain away some of the following proofs.

To Gen. vi. 5, it might be replied, that the description applied only to the children of mankind at that particular time. But without staying to ask, how there came about such a state of universal wickedness that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually," what are we to make of the still clearer declaration *after* the flood? "The Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is *evil from his youth*." Gen. viii. 21. God had just destroyed the earth with a flood, and he now promises never to do so

again; and why? Was it because all the wicked had been swept away, and only righteous Noah with his family left, so that their descendants might henceforth be expected to live righteously, and therefore no such universal punishment ever again be required? This would have been very natural reasoning on the Unitarian theory: if there be no inherent depravity in human nature, it must have seemed very unlikely that the world would ever be overspread with wickedness again, after the tremendous purification it had just received. Yet how different the reason given by God for making that gracious covenant never again to curse the ground for man's sake: "for every imagination of man's heart is evil *from his youth*." Man's nature was so radically corrupt and fallen, that in spite of any warnings, judgments, or advantages whatever, his evil propensities would assuredly break through all restraints, "the whole world" would still lie "in wickedness;" and if the Almighty were to continue such general destructions as often as general apostacy called for them, they would be occurring perpetually. As therefore it was not the Lord's purpose to inflict a similar judgment again till the end of the world, he made a promise and covenant with mankind to that effect. If this declaration of Jehovah's does not afford a decisive proof of the doctrine in question, human language could not supply words that would do so. But let us proceed: "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Job xiv. 4. "What is man that he should be clean? and he *which is born of a woman*, that he should be righteous?" Job xv. 14. "How then can man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean, *that is born of a woman?*" Job xxv. 4. "Behold, I was *shapen* in iniquity, and in sin did my mother *conceive* me." Ps. li. 5. I know not what explanations *may* be given to get out of this passage, but the only one I ever heard of is this, that David means to say he was not born in lawful wedlock—a very likely thing for him to introduce into a sacred penitential Psalm for public worship! Why it would have been as bad as the crime he was lamenting; "for he that said, Do not commit adultery, said also," Honour thy father and thy mother. Again: "The wicked are estranged *from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born*, speaking lies." Ps. lviii. 3. It may be said, that David here only speaks of "the wicked," meaning vicious immoral characters; so he does, but he traces their wickedness to its origin, the corrupt nature, which they received "*from the womb*." Now no one, I suppose, will deny that, if "the wicked" are born so, all are. The latter part of the text however requires a few words of explanation. The Psalmist cannot mean to say, that children tell lies the moment they are born, because it would be a physical impossibility; but that they are born with

a nature prone to all kinds of evil, which will be seen in the actual commission of evil, as soon as they are capable of being tempted to it; lying being one of the first sins perceptible in children, because it is one of the first, which there is any temptation for them to commit.\* And here let us correct an error, which Unitarians seem to fall into with regard to the doctrine of original sin. No one considers that children are *as* wicked and bad, or to be viewed with the same feelings, as those who have grown up in vice and iniquity. We contend for the entire depravity of human nature from the very birth, just as we contend that the entire properties of an oak exist in an acorn; but no one pretends to say that the acorn is as large or as strong as the oak into which it grows. Instead of attacking the scripture doctrine of human depravity, Unitarians often labour to disprove their own caricature of it; and especially with reference to this text.

To proceed. "Who can say, I have made my heart clean, I am pure from my sin?" Prov. xx. 9. This of course is as much as to say, that no one can—with truth. And what should prevent us, but the inherent corruption of our nature? Indeed St. Paul distinctly states this in the 7th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans: a chapter which will admit of no rational interpretation, except on the principles we are contending for. Again, "Foolishness is bound in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction shall drive it far from him." Prov. xxii. 15. Foolishness or folly invariably in scripture means sin, as a fool invariably means a wicked man. "*The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked, who can know it?*" Jer. xvii. 9. "*Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, &c.*" Matt. xv. 19. "For what the Law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of *sinful flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." Rom. viii. 3. "Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and the mind, and were *by nature* the children of wrath, even as others." Eph. ii. 3. I was about to give a line or two on this text, but I found I could invent no words stronger than the apostle's own, and therefore can do nothing better than repeat them, "*and were by nature the children of wrath even as others.*" Which is this, "a falsehood or a forgery?"

\* One would really think that no Unitarian could ever have had any thing to do with the bringing up of children. How any one, that has, can doubt their nature being fallen and prone to sin, is to me a perfect mystery. Do not evil propensities shew themselves with the first dawn of intellect, even when a child is under the most favourable circumstances possible, as regards training and example? Why, we might as well attempt to deny a child's being born with a propensity to breathe, as deny its propensity to sin. "*Facts are stubborn things*"—but not so stubborn as man's heart, when it is determined not to believe.

The last argument I would draw from scripture is the fact of man being there represented as, *universally*, a *sinning, suffering, dying* creature. Ecc. vii. 20. "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not." What is the reason of this *universal* failure? Again, Job v. 7. "Man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upwards." How is this? Is not *suffering* the fruit of *sin*? \* Again, Heb. ix. 27. "It is appointed unto men once to die." Remember that "*the wages of sin* is death," and then ask yourself why death is universally "appointed unto men." This argument however, strong as it is, becomes much more so when applied to the case of infants; and in this very way it is used by St. Paul in the 5th ch. of his Epistle to the Romans. In this chapter are to be found the following six statements; "*By one man* sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned"—"*Through the offence of one* many be dead"—"The judgment was *by one* to condemnation"—"*By one man's offence* death reigned by one"—"*By the offence of one* judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation," and "*By one man's disobedience* many were made sinners." I leave the explanation of all this to those who think it requires any; the verses I particularly wish your attention to being the 13th and 14th. The apostle is arguing, that mankind were under some Divine law before the law of Moses was given; and the way he proves it is this: If they had been bound by no Divine law, sin could not have been imputed to them, that is, they could not have been dealt with and punished as sinners; for sin is the transgression of the law, and therefore if there was no law, there could be no sin. But it is evident that sin *was* imputed to them; and why? Because during the whole of that period, before the law was given by Moses, *infants died*! "For until (that is before) the law sin was in the world. Nevertheless *death reigned* from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned *after the similitude of Adam's transgression*;" that is, over them that had not committed actual sin, namely, infants. The death of infants then proved, according to the apostle's argument, that sin was *imputed to them*, that they were dealt with *as sinners*, death being the wages of sin. This can only be accounted for in two ways; either that the sin of Adam was *their* sin, because they were "in the loins of their father" when he fell; or that they inherited from him a sinful nature, which justly exposed them to the penalty of death, even before they could commit actual sin. For myself I receive them both unhesi-

\* The sufferings of the brute creation may be an exception to this; but there can be little doubt that they are connected in some way with the fall of man, although the subject is allowed to be one of the most mysterious within our knowledge.

saugly; but the Unitarian may take which alternative he pleases—that is, if he can separate them. To this we need only add the passages already brought from the writings of the same apostle, with the testimony of our Lord himself, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh:” “*Out of the heart* proceed evil thoughts, murders,” &c. and then compare them with the following assertion of Mr. Barker’s—“Nothing in the world can be plainer, that that either Christ and Paul were entirely wrong, or that the orthodox doctrine of natural total depravity is a gross anti-christian fiction”!!

One more point remains to be considered, namely, the effect ascribed to the teaching of this doctrine by the writer just alluded to. It must be premised, that having proved the doctrine from scripture, we are not responsible for its effects or consequences: all we have to do is to believe and teach what is found in God’s word, and leave Him to work with it, as he pleases, upon men’s hearts and lives. Still it may be useful to expose this admirable specimen of special pleading, and therefore you shall hear his own words. “Only imagine this doctrine to be taught to a thoughtful intelligent child. ‘My dear child,’ says the orthodox teacher, ‘Do you know who made you?’ *Child*.—Yes, God Almighty. *Teacher*.—Do you know *how* he made you?’ *C*.—No, do you? please tell me, if you do. *T*.—I will tell you. He made you utterly corrupt: he made your souls quite unholy, utterly depraved, in the image of the devil and of the brute. He made you so utterly corrupt, that you can neither *do* what is right, nor *speak* what is right, nor *think* what is right until you are quite made over again. *C*.—Why did he make me so? *T*.—Because Adam, six thousand years ago, did wrong. *C*.—But Adam’s fault was not my fault. I could not help what Adam did. *T*.—No, but though Adam’s fault was not yours, God *imputes* it to you, or he acts towards you as *if* it were your fault. He is equally angry with you as if you had committed the fault yourself. *C*.—*Angry* with me? *T*.—Yes, *angry* with you. You are under his wrath and curse just now. *C*.—What for? *T*.—Because of Adam’s transgression. *C*.—But *I* could not help it. *T*.—No, God knows that; but you still are under his wrath and curse notwithstanding. *C*.—Am I made then both utterly depraved, and under God’s wrath and curse on account of the sin of Adam? *T*.—Yes, and some say you are liable to eternal torments in hell-fire as well, on account of Adam’s sin. *C*.—It surely cannot be true. *T*.—But you will be damned if you doubt it. It is one of the essential doctrines of the gospel, and God has ordered that all those who doubt or disbelieve this, shall be sentenced to everlasting torments. Do you not *love* God my child for all this? Do you not feel thankful to him for making you so corrupt? Is it not a de-

lightful thing to think that you are thus created in the image of the devil and the brute, under God's wrath and curse, and that you are obliged either to believe all this, or else be doomed to everlasting torments? Horrible! I can go no further in my suppositions. The devil himself could hardly covet such an employment, as to instil such horrors and blasphemies into the child-like mind. I say it is horrible. If children were taught this doctrine in its plain, unsightly form, they could hardly fail, either to see that the doctrine was false, or to feel the utmost possible horror and hatred of the being that could be guilty of the crimes which it charges upon God."

This long extract is given in full, partly to prevent any complaint of its being garbled, and partly to shew many, who would not otherwise be aware of it, the sort of poison which is being industriously circulated about this neighbourhood. I am sure no thoughtful intelligent person will consider it at all too strong language, when I call this passage an atrocious fabrication, and gross libel upon orthodox teaching. If children were taught that doctrine in *such* a "naked unsightly form" as he has caricatured it, it would certainly not be very likely to produce a proper effect upon their minds.\* But Mr. Barker perfectly well *knew*, while he was writing it, that children are *not* taught it in that form, nor any one else either: he also knew, that there is a right way and a wrong way of teaching every thing, and that there is not a doctrine in the bible, but what might in the same manner be turned into ridicule, or shown off in a false light. A child especially requires to be "fed with milk and not with meat; for he is not able to bear it." The corruption and wickedness of its own heart is, no doubt, one of the first things, which a spiritually-minded

\* "Only imagine" the following conversation between "a thoughtful intelligent child," who had been born blind, and a Unitarian Teacher. T.—Do you know who made you? C.—Yes, God Almighty. T.—Do you know *how* he made you? C.—No, do you? Please tell me, if you do. T.—I will tell you. He made you quite blind, without the least power of enjoying the beauties of Creation all around you. Other children can play about, and see the green fields, and the sun shining, and amuse themselves in a number of ways, and when they grow up can work for their bread; but God has deprived *you* of all these comforts and enjoyments, and brought you into the world in such a state, that you will always be dependent upon others, and have to be led about wherever you go, and suffer a thousand inconveniences. Besides, he has caused you to be born of such poor parents, that you cannot even have the advantages which many other blind children have. C.—Why did he make me so? T.—I don't know; because he chose—Some would say, for your own good. C.—*For my own good*? T.—Yes, *for your own good*: he loves you very much. C.—How can he, when he has made me blind? T.—Oh, but you will be damned, if you doubt it; for it is written in the Bible, that God is Love. C.—Then how much more he must love the children that he has given eyesight to? T.—No, it is blasphemy to think that, for that would be making God partial. Do you not *love* God, my child, for all this? Do you not feel thankful to him for making you blind? Is it not a delightful thing to think that you are thus created without the possibility of joining in the occupations, amusements, and pleasures of the children around you? "Horrible! I can go no farther in my suppositions. The devil himself," &c., &c.



teacher would impress upon a child; but not in the "form" given by Mr. Barker—rather after that given by our Lord in his conversation with Nicodemus. *T.*—Do you ever pray for a new heart? *C.*—No, why should I? *T.*—Because the bible tells you that, "except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." *C.*—What is the meaning of being born again? *T.*—The entire conversion of your soul to God; being made a new creature; having your will, affections, desires, and feelings all changed; being made to hate sin and love holiness. Your heart is so "deceitful," that you may fancy yourself good enough for heaven; but you must pray to be enlightened from above, that you may "know the plague of your own heart," and see it to be, what the bible says it is, "desperately wicked:" and then you must pray for a new heart, a new nature, and say, "Create in me a clean heart, O Lord, and renew a right spirit within me." *C.*—How came my heart to be so bad? Did God make it so? *T.*—No,—"God made man upright," but man fell from his uprightness by sinning against God, and so he became alienated from God, his nature became corrupt and sinful, and that nature you inherit from your parents; so that you were born in sin, and are "by nature a child of wrath, even as others;" for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh,"—and can never be anything else, until it is born again of the Spirit. You may not be able to comprehend the whole of this subject at first; nay, there are mysteries in the gospel, which are beyond the reach of any one to fathom, as the bible tells us continually; but you must ask God to show you the plan of salvation, to teach you all that is necessary for you to know, to guide you into all truth, to keep you from all error, and give you grace to "receive with meekness" whatever he tells you in his word, however difficult or mysterious it may appear to your mind. *C.*—Is there any danger in disbelieving what God tells us? *T.*—Yes, "he that believeth not shall be damned;" but "he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved." *C.*—What *has* God told us? *T.*—That he gave his only begotten Son to be the propitiation or atonement for our sins, and that whosoever believeth on him shall not perish, but have everlasting life. Saving faith is "the gift of God"; if you ask him for it humbly and earnestly, he will give it you; and then you will enjoy pardon and peace here, and everlasting happiness hereafter. Do you not *love* God, my child, for all this? Do you not feel thankful to him for giving his own Son to die for you, and promising to send his Holy Spirit to take away your heart of stone, and give you a heart of flesh? Is it not a delightful thing to think that, though you are such a lost, guilty, ruined creature, yet a remedy is provided, a ransom found, and a refuge open to you, which you may flee to and

be safe? Is it not a delightful thing to think, that a Saviour is ready to receive you, who will wash you from your sins in his blood; who will cleanse you from their guilt, deliver you from their power, and after death raise you up to a glorious immortality, where sin, sorrow and sighing will flee away, and you will reign with Christ for ever and ever? Is *this* enough to make you love God, who has so loved you? and should you not pray for those of your fellow-creatures, who are so blinded by Satan, that being ignorant of their own guilty ruined state, they will neither seek to be born again of the Holy Spirit, nor to be washed in the "fountain" of Immanuel's blood, that is "open for sin and for uncleanness"? Delightful! The highest Archangel might well covet such an employment as to instil such glorious truths into the child like mind. If children are only taught this doctrine in its scriptural form, and the Spirit's blessing accompany the instruction, they cannot fail to see its truth, and feel the utmost possible love and gratitude to the Being, who has made such a wondrous display of mercy and compassion.

---

EPITAPH ON A TOMB-STONE AT CAMBRIDGE.

Bold Infidelity, turn pale and die;  
 Beneath this stone four sleeping infants lie:  
     Say, are they lost or saved?  
 If death's by sin, they sinned—for they are here;  
 If Heaven's by works, in Heaven they can't appear.  
     Ah! reason how depraved!  
 Revere the Bible's sacred page; the knot's untied;  
 They died, for Adam sinned; they live, for Jesus died.

## LECTURE VII.

### THE TRINITY.

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Matt. xxviii. 19.

HAVING in our last Lecture shown one part of man's fall, from a state of loving obedient dependence upon God, with the remedy provided for it, in regeneration or being born again of the Holy Spirit; there remains to be considered the second part of his fall, from the favour of God into a state of condemnation, with the remedy provided for it, in the redemption, propitiation, or atonement of Jesus Christ. But as the efficacy of the atonement depends upon the Deity of Christ, it will be necessary to prepare the way for the proof of that, by first showing the scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity.

The word Trinity is taken from a Latin word (*tres*) which means three; the word unity is taken from another, (*unus*) which means one: a triune being therefore is a being who is both three and one, both a Trinity and a Unity. Such a being, scripture teaches us, is God. If we are to believe God's own record of himself, we must be both Unitarians and Trinitarians; to be either without the other would be equally unscriptural. This shows, that when we call deniers of the Trinity by the name of Unitarians, it is only on the same principle that we call Papists by the name of Catholics; because, having assumed it to themselves, it has got to be in common use, and is generally understood. But it is necessary to protest against the usurpation; for, though we are Trinitarians and Protestants, we are also Unitarians and Catholics. All arguments and texts therefore brought to prove that God is One, that there is but one Lord, that his name is One, and so on, are just as much on our side as on the Socinian's. They establish one essential part of our doctrine—the Unity of God. People are often deceived by a great array of texts concerning God's Unity, which are produced to disprove his Trinity. We insist that God is One, just as strongly as our opponents do; therefore what can be the use, when arguing against us, of heaping up proofs of what we are both agreed on? The only use it can be, is to deceive ignorant persons into the idea that they have proved their point, when in reality they have only proved what no one denies: they have proved the Unity, but have not gone one step towards *disproving* the Trinity. Let them bring a single text to prove that God's Unity is *not* a compound Unity,

that *in his unity* there is *not* a trinity, and then they will be coming to the point. But they well know that, however many are the assertions in scripture of there being only one God, there is not a word which can be tortured into a proof, that this *one God* is not *also* three Persons.

But the thing is absurd, we are told, and impossible in itself: *how can* God, or anything else, be both three and one? Do you remember St. Paul's answer to the objector, who said, *How* are the dead raised up, and with what body do they come? If a bucket could be endued with speech and reason, and was to say, I'll not believe there is such a thing as the ocean, because I cannot contain it,—would it be greater folly than that of a worm like man, who will not believe what God reveals of his own nature, because the mysteries of the Infinite cannot be compressed within the compass of his finite mind; because he cannot *conceive* it, or understand *how* it is so? "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty unto perfection? It is as high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than hell; what canst thou know? The measure thereof is longer than the earth, and broader than the sea. If he cut off, and shut up, or gather together, then who can hinder him? For he knoweth vain man: he seeth wickedness also; will he not then consider it? For vain man would be wise, though man be born like a wild ass's colt." Job xi. 7—12. Did you ever try to realise to your mind the existence of a God at all? Hear the words of a man who possessed one of the greatest minds that ever a Christian minister was gifted with,—Robert Hall; "How the Divine Being exists in an essential and eternal nature of his own, without beginning as well as without end: how he can be present at the same moment in every point of boundless space, without excluding any one of his creatures from the room it occupies: how, unseen, unfelt by all, he can maintain a pervading and intimate acquaintance and contact with all parties and all portions of the universe: how he can be at once all eye, all ear, all presence, all energy, yet interfere with none of the perceptions and actions of his creatures,—this is what equally baffles the mightiest and the meanest intellect. This is the great mystery of the universe, which is at once the most certain and the most incomprehensible of all things; a truth enveloped at once in a flood of light and in an abyss of darkness. Inexplicable itself, it explains all besides. It casts a clearness on every question, accounts for every phenomenon, solves every problem, illuminates every depth, and renders the whole mystery of existence as perfectly simple, as it is otherwise perfectly unintelligible: while itself alone remains in impenetrable obscurity. After displacing every other difficulty, it remains the greatest of all, in solitary, insurmountable, unapproachable grandeur. So truly 'clouds and darkness are round about him; he maketh darkness his secret habitation, his pavilion to cover him thick clouds.'"

Yes; to allow God's eternity, *that he never had a beginning*, and then to say that his Trinity is too difficult a thing to believe, is indeed to "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel." But although we fully acknowledge, that there are unfathomable mysteries connected with the doctrine of the trinity, especially in reference to the Son's incarnation, yet as far as the simple fact of a tri-unity is concerned, we contend that the idea is perfectly familiar to our minds, that numberless instances of it are perpetually before our eyes, and there is *not the slightest difficulty* either in understanding or believing it. The Pope's *triple* crown is but one crown. A committee formed of three persons is but one committee. The Prime Minister and other officers under the Queen form but one government. All the electors in a borough form but one constituency, all the members but one House of Commons, the Peers but one House of Lords, and the two Houses together but one Parliament. Husband, wife and children make but one family, many houses but one town, many drops of water but one river, root branches and leaves but one tree. Many letters make but one word, many words but one sentence, many sentences but one page, many pages but one book, many books but one library. Again, many soldiers make but one regiment, and many regiments but one army. In fact we may safely challenge the Unitarian to produce a single thing, either in nature or art, that is a *simple* unity. Unities there are in abundance: an army, a parliament, a book, is each a unity; but they are all *compound* unities. And this, be it observed, is the thing cavilled at as impossible and absurd in the Godhead. No one pretends, that there is any peculiar difficulty in the number three, more than any other number: what the Unitarian pronounces incredible being the *plurality* of persons in the Godhead; that is, there being *more persons than one*—the word plurality being taken from a Latin word (*plures*) which means 'more.' How marvellous! compelled to acknowledge that every thing around him, down to the minutest atom that the microscope reveals, is a plurality or compound unity, he yet thinks it incredible, that the Maker of them all should be one himself! But the works of creation, be it observed, not only show a plurality in every unity, but in a wonderful number of cases that plurality is found to be a trinity; nay, the deeper science penetrates into the elements of nature, the more certain does it appear, that *all* creation is a "tri-une shadow" of it's Maker. Take for example the rainbow. What a trinity in unity is this! "The rainbow, which is light analysed, is but three colours, blue, yellow, and red, with their intermediate shades. I think no one of these can be mixed or made of others, and *in their union they produce colourless light*." Pure light has no colour; and therefore, although rendering other things visible, is invisible itself. Light is not a simple, but a compound, unity: and being composed of *three* colours, it is a trinity. In the rainbow, this in-

visible unity is rendered visible, by being resolved into its three component parts, red, yellow, and blue; which colours however are *not three, but one*, rainbow. This rainbow is "a token of the covenant" between God and all the earth that he will never destroy it any more with a flood. Now for the application. "God is Light," pure white colourless light, —invisible. This triune Godhead, (which like the light is not a simple, but a compound unity) is "*manifested*" or rendered visible, by the incarnation of one of its persons in human form. And this manifestation of Deity in the person of Jesus Christ, is "the Mediator of the new covenant," in virtue of which, "all that believe in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life."

One more instance must suffice; but that one perhaps the most perfect that the universe can supply. Did it never strike you, while you were denying the possibility of a trinity in God, that you are a trinity *yourself*—body, soul, and spirit, yet but one man? Did it never strike you *why* you are a trinity? That you were made *in the image of God*? "Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness," were the words of Jehovah the Elohim, and man stood forth a trinity in unity, body, soul and spirit, the triune image of his Maker. No doubt man was also made in the moral image of God, "in righteousness and true holiness," and likewise in the bodily image of that form, in which God had from eternity determined to manifest himself;\* but his trinity I believe to have been the chief point of the purposed resemblance. That man is a trinity, even science, unaided by scripture, has long ago discovered; although it is not always easy or possible to fix the exact functions of the three component parts. We have no need, however, to stand on any such ground, for we have the infallible authority of an inspired apostle to certify us of the fact; "I pray God your whole *spirit, and soul, and body*, be preserved blameless unto the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Thes. v. 23. And yet this very tri-une man has the folly to deny the possibility of a Trinity in the God, after whose image he was created. "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools," and give but too plain a proof, that in *reason*, and *understanding*, as well as in righteousness and holiness, man is a fallen creature.

There are others, however, who profess their perfect readiness to believe the doctrine, if it can be proved from scripture: but these two things seem to stagger them; that the words trinity, triune, &c. never occur in the Bible,† and that the doctrine is not fully and clearly taught in any one place. To the first I would reply; neither is the word Deity in the Bible—then is there no such thing? How fond Unitarians are of

\* St. Paul calls Adam "the figure of him that was to come." Rom. v. 14.

† Socinus himself acknowledges the unreasonableness of this objection in the following words:—"It is sufficient with all lovers of the truth, that the thing itself, about which a question is raised, should be confirmed by reasons or proofs; although the words, which are used in unfolding the question, may not be expressly written.

talking about "the supreme Being," "the great Author of all things," "the moral Governor of the universe;"—are any of these expressions in Scripture? No, but the word *Deus*, we are told, from which *Deity* is derived, may be found in a Latin Bible. What has that to do with it? No doubt the *thing* *Deity* is in scripture; so is the *thing* *Trinity*—the cavil in both cases is about the *word*. Is there such a word as *Christianity* in either the Old or New Testament? or *Morality*? or *Unitarianism*? Perhaps we shall be told that the word *unus*, from which *Unitarianism* is derived, may be found in a Latin Bible; but *unus* means one, not *Unitarianism*; as *Deus* means God, not *Godhead*—which is the meaning of *Deity*. The fact is, that Unitarians, as well as every other sect, are compelled to go out of scripture for terms to express their belief, on account of the different meanings put upon nearly every expression in scripture. If we were all confined to scripture words, it would be utterly impossible to tell, what any single person believed about any single doctrine. For such is the perverse ingenuity of man in torturing God's words to make them express *his* sentiments, that every sect and party claim the Bible on their side. A creed drawn up only in scriptural words, would be readily subscribed to by Baptist and Protestant, Calvinist and Unitarian; and yet while avowing the same belief, their opinions would be as opposite as black and white, because each would attach his own meaning to the words.\* As a mutual accommodation therefore, in order to understand one another, we agree to state our separate opinions of what the words of scripture mean, in other words. The Unitarian and I both profess to believe "the gospel of Jesus Christ," "the truth as it is in Jesus," and so on; but as these words convey a very different idea to his mind and to mine, we agree to call what *he* thinks "the gospel of Jesus Christ" means, by the name of *Unitarianism*; and what *I* think it means, by the name of *Trinitarianism*. And then the very man, who calls himself a *Unitarian*, and his creed *Unitarianism*, and who talks about the *Deity*, the *Supreme Being*, &c. &c. actually turns round and declares our belief to be unscriptural, *because the word Trinity is not in the Bible!!* Why if we are to use no words but what are in the Bible, how are we to preach, teach, or expound? we must do nothing but read it. If it has to be explained at all, it must of course be explained in other words. Why does the Unitarian use the words *Christianity*, or *Morality*? Because it is a short easy way of expressing a complex idea. All the different things, which make up *Christianity* or *Morality*, might no doubt be mentioned in scriptural words, whenever he wanted to convey the idea; but it would be a long troublesome process. For the same reason we use the word *Trinity*.

\* How could the ruling powers in any Christian Church obey the command in Titus iii. 10 about rejecting a heretic, if they could only examine him in scriptural words? It would be impossible to detect him! A well known instance will at once occur to the minds of many who read this.

Each part of the doctrine may be stated, if you like it, in scripture language; but to speak of the Trinity is a shorter and easier way of expressing the complex idea.

The second part of the objection however yet remains.—Why was not either some such word used in the bible, or the doctrine so fully and explicitly stated, as to leave no room for doubt or difficulty in the matter? To which I reply, You will have an opportunity soon, when you stand before God's judgment seat, of asking him, if you have the courage, why his revelation was given in this way or that way; why this was put in, and that left out: and we shall then see whether you will plead as an excuse for disbelieving the doctrine of the Trinity, that, although the Bible told you the Father was God, the Son God, the Holy Ghost God, and still that there was but one God,—yet that it was not all stated *in one place*, and in such words as you thought it *ought* to have been expressed in. Meanwhile let me remind you, that the Bible itself does not warrant our expecting to find Divine truth laying open on its surface, to be picked up without any search or investigation; but quite the contrary: “Yea if thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God.” Prov. ii. 3—5. “The knowledge of God” was never intended to be taught in the Bible, so that no one could help seeing it, nor any one be able to doubt or deny it;\* it is written in such a way as to test our humility, our meekness, our faith, and the earnestness of our desire after it. If every doctrine were taught in the way some appear to think necessary, where would be the use of David's prayer, “*Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold wondrous things out of thy law*”? What force would there be in the promise, “*The meek will he guide in judgment*”? in the apostle's declaration, that Divine truth can only be “spiritually discerned”? or in our Lord's thanksgiving to the Father “that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes”?—that is, unto those who are willing to “receive the kingdom of God as a little child,” believing whatever God tells them just *as* and *how* he pleases. But how could the doctrine of the Trinity, for instance, have been “hid” from any one, if it had been stated in the Bible after the manner of the Athanasian creed? No, God has revealed all saving truth in his word, in such a way that none *shall* discover it, but those who are willing to learn it *in his own way*: from all others it is “hid.” And what is that appointed way? Diligently to “search the scriptures,” “comparing spiritual things with spiritual,” and to pray earnestly

\* Not a *single* doctrine is so taught. Even the *manhood* of Christ is, and always has been, denied by some professing Christians. The Swedenborgians contend that he was *only* God, and that the Scriptures no where teach his *real* manhood.



for the teaching and guidance of the Holy Spirit; "If thou *crist* after knowledge, and liftest up thy *voice* for understanding; if thou *seekest* her as silver, and *searchest* for her as for hid treasure, then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God." Yet the Unitarian's argument *against* the Trinity is, that all this is *required* in order to prove it from Scripture. Without allowing for a moment that the doctrine is not taught in single texts, we readily grant that the chief evidence for it is obtained by "comparing spiritual things with spiritual,"—and this we shall now, by God's help, proceed to do.

The first point we shall prove is, that God is a compound, not a simple, unity; in other words, that the Godhead consists of a plurality of persons—without reference at present to the particular number of persons. This idea of God, as a plurality, is the idea that must have been conveyed to the mind of Jews, by the general language of the Old Testament, as read in its original Hebrew.

To commence with the argument from the word Elohim; an argument to my mind absolutely decisive.—The Hebrew word Eloah means God; the plural of it, Elohim, of course means Gods. Now in the Old Testament, Jehovah is called Elohim 2500 times, while he is called Eloah only 60 times. Under any circumstances, this would be remarkable: "But the utter improbability of the gratuitous use of the plural name, under the circumstances of the Jewish dispensation, has never received an answer. The great Jewish doctrine was the *Unity*. The great distinction of the Jewish ritual was the worship of the *one* Godhead. The whole ceremonial law, rigid and minute as it is, was the guardian of this doctrine. The first command, on the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, was an unsparing destruction of all things which could betray them into the native idolatry. Yet in the books which they were to receive as the direct testimony of heaven, as their guides and consolation, as the substance of their law, and the promise of their national welfare, they found the constant use of a word, which, on the common principles of language, expressed a plurality in the supreme Being. For the use of this word, what was the necessity? Their language was not destitute of other terms to express the Deity. They had the name Jehovah; or if this was too sacred for adoption on general occasions, they might have used the singular Eloah. But the extreme hazard of justifying the popular tendency to the worship of a plurality of Gods was to be encountered, and for nothing: and this too in a religion pre-eminently scrupulous, and where all things, even to the fringe of a priest's garment, were regulated by an express ordinance of heaven! This objection was so perfectly felt by the Jews, from the period when they began to pervert the literal meaning of scripture; that the Rabbins in consequence, established it as a rule in their grammars, that in all instances of dominion and honour, the plural may be used for

the singular—a rule confessedly naked of all authority.”\* But what necessity is pretended for the use of such an apparently dangerous word? Why, Mr. Barker tells us, the surrounding nations had so universally fallen into idolatry, worshipping many *Gods*, that the singular word Eloah (*God*) was lost. Now only think of this. Because *other* nations always spoke of *Gods*, the *Hebrews* had lost their word *God*! and because their neighbours were guilty of idolatry, *which they were to be especially preserved from, and were continually guarded against*, they were to borrow their idolatrous language, and call Jehovah “our *Gods*”! In addition to which we must remark, 1st, That no heathen nation under the sun was ever known to use the plural word *Gods* without the singular *God*; even the Chinese, with their millions of Deities, speaking of the *God Vishnoo*, the *God Shiva*, &c. &c.; 2nd, That the Hebrew word Eloah was *not* lost, being found sixty times in the Old Testament; and 3rd, That if it had been, there were other singular names, as Jehovah, by which *God* might have been called. Mr. Barker’s attempt therefore to account for it utterly fails.

But if the word proves any thing, it may be replied, it proves that there are more *Gods* than one.—Taken by itself it might; but the same Old Testament, in which it occurs, declares pointedly, that there is but one *God*; and so we are driven from *that* ground also. Besides the very peculiar way in which the word is used, is as much opposed to Polytheism, that is, a belief in many *Gods*, as it is to Unitarianism, and can only be accounted for on the Trinitarian theory of a plurality of persons in one *Godhead*. Every one acquainted with grammar, knows that a singular noun is always joined to a singular verb, and a plural noun to a plural verb.† For instance, if I say, “*God was* looking,” is is good grammar; because the noun ‘*God*’ and the verb ‘*was*’ are both singular; or if I say “‘*The Gods were* looking,” it is good grammar, because the noun ‘*Gods*’ and the verb ‘*were*’ are both plural; but if I say, “*God were* looking,” or the “*Gods was* looking,” it would be bad grammar, because in both cases I should be joining together singular and plural. Now in the Old Testament, contrary to the rules of every language in the world, the plural noun Elohim is very frequently‡ joined to a singular verb; showing, that although there is something in the nature of *God* which justifies the use of a plural name, yet he is but one *God*, not many.¶ To the Unitarian’s question, therefore, How can *God* be both one and

\* Dr. Croly.

† Singular means that there is only one of a thing; plural, that there are more than one.

‡ The fact, that it is sometimes used with *plural* verbs and adjectives, makes the argument doubly strong for a *plurality of persons*; while it leaves the fact of its being at other times used with *singular* verbs are equally strong arguments for the unity of those persons in one *Godhead*.

¶ For this reason Elohim is always translated *God*, not *Gods*; though the wisdom of thus entirely losing sight of the peculiar force of the original word may well be doubted.

three? we reply by another—How can he be both singular and plural? which the Old Testament distinctly implies\* that he is, hundreds of times.

It is objected further, that the name of God never occurs in the plural in the *New Testament*. To which I reply 1st, That God's nature cannot change; and therefore if he was a plurality when the Old Testament was written, he must be so still: and 2nd, That there was no necessity for it; as the doctrine of the Trinity is there stated much more fully and distinctly in other ways. That *indirect* way of teaching it, by the use of a plural noun with a singular verb, and other expressions about to be noticed, is much more in accordance with the general method of teaching employed in the Old Testament, than with that of the New. The light of the Jewish dispensation was but dim, compared with ours. They were taught by type and shadow, by allusion and inference: in general, truth was rather *implied*, than directly asserted; though implied so strongly, as to leave no doubt in the mind of a humble and sincere inquirer. Learned critics may add other reasons, but the above is quite sufficient; and we may now leave this part of the argument with an assured conviction that the proof of a plurality of persons in the Godhead drawn from the use of the word Elohim in the Old Testament, never has been, and never can be, shaken by all the learning or ingenuity that Infidelity has brought to bear upon it.†

Turn then to Gen i. 26. "And God (Elohim) said, Let us make man in *our* image, after *our* likeness." This is so plain, that nothing is wanted, but an examination of the way in which Unitarians attempt to get out of it. They remind us, that kings and authors say 'We' instead of 'I'; and Mr. Barker characteristically adds, that one child will say to another, "Come, give us a bit"! Now that God often speaks after the manner of men, no one denies; but that any human being can really believe in the bottom of his heart, that the infinite Jehovah used the above language in any of the three ways suggested, I certainly feel very much inclined to doubt. A child in common speech uses bad grammar; an author calls himself 'We' to avoid the egotistical sound of the word 'I'; a king does the same, to show that he acts not on his own sole authority, but either in conjunction with his parliament, or "by and with the advice of his privy council;"—and in imitation of one or all of these Jehovah says, "Let us make man in *our* image"! And this before king, author, or child ever

\* Unitarians harp a good deal upon that word 'imply'—as if there was no such thing as *proof* by implication. If a Christian sees any thing plainly *implied* in Holy Writ, he dare no more doubt it than if it was asserted in as many words.

† It may strengthen the argument to observe, that not only the word Elohim, but other words applied to God, are also used in the plural number; as for instance Isa. liv. 5, is in the original, "Thy *Makers* is thy husband;" Eccl. xii. 1 is "Remember thy *Creators* in the days of thy youth;" Mal. i. 6, is, "If I be *Masters*, where is my fear?" and Prov. iv. 10, is, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom, and the knowledge of the *Holy Ones* is understanding."

existed!!! There might have been some reason in saying that *they* imitated *his* language, however profane such imitation would have been; but that he imitated theirs before a man had ever been created—we really must be excused admitting as an explanation of the words. Besides, if in this particular expression God spoke after the manner of men, he would scarcely imitate the style of *modern English*, but more probably of ancient Hebrew; and here the theory altogether breaks down. For omitting the case of the child as too frivolous for notice, the Old Testament of itself affords abundant proof, that in ancient times and eastern countries, neither authors nor kings said ‘we’ for ‘I,’ or ‘our’ for ‘my.’ If any one is still not satisfied, I can only ask him as a last hope, whether he thinks any king, author, child, or any other person whatever, at any time, or in any country of the world, when speaking of himself, ever used such an expression as we find in the next chapter but one; “And the Lord God said, Behold the man is become *as one of us*, to know good and evil.”\* Gen. iii. 22. If it be suggested, that God may in these expressions include angels or archangels, we reply 1st, that this would be making angels sharers in the glory of *creation*, which is the sole prerogative of Deity; and 2nd, that there is no hint whatever in the narrative itself of any such thing, nor could the supposition be entertained without doing violence to the evident meaning of the sacred record. “Who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor?”

To proceed “And the Lord said, Behold the people is one; and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let *us* go down, and there confound their language.” Gen. xi. 6, 7. “Also, I heard the voice of the Lord, saying, Whom shall *I* send, and who will go for *us*?” Is. vi. 8. “Wherefore it shall come to pass, when *the Lord* hath performed *his* whole work upon mount Zion and on Jerusalem, *I* will punish the fruit of the stout heart of the king of Assyria.” Is. x. 12. According to all the ordinary usages of language it should have been, either “When the Lord hath performed *his* work, *he* will punish,” or “When *I* have performed *my* work, *I* will punish.” But how is the change from ‘his’ to ‘I’ to be accounted for, since the same Lord is the speaker and the person spoken of? This mode of expression, in reference to God, abounds in the Old Testament. “Behold the Lord will carry thee away \* \* \* *he* will surely turn and toss thee, \* \* \* and *I* will drive thee from thy station.” Is. xxii. 17, 19. “Neither hath the eye seen, *O God*, beside *thee*, what *he* hath prepared for him that waiteth for *him*.” Is. lxiv. 4. “And *I* will strengthen them in the Lord:

\* If it be asked, why man, being a trinity, might not use such an expression with propriety—we reply, that man is a trinity in a very inferior sense to that in which God is so. Though a striking “image” of his Maker, he is *but* an image; only made “*after the likeness*” of the Triune Jehovah,

and they shall walk up and down in *his* name, saith the Lord." Zech. x. 12. "*For thus saith the Lord of Hosts; After the glory hath he sent me unto the nations which spoiled you; for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his eye. For behold I will shake mine hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants; and ye shall know that the Lord of Hosts hath sent me.*" Zech. ii. 8, 9.\* Here both *the sender* and *the sent* are expressly called *the Lord of Hosts*: and yet Unitarians assert that Jesus Christ cannot be God, *because he is sent by the Father!* This argument however is seen in its strongest light in those numerous passages, where Jehovah, speaking to man, is called an angel, which means, as every one knows, a messenger, that is, one sent by, and speaking or acting under the authority of another. A few of the most prominent of these we shall now bring before you. Our only business with them at present, is to prove a plurality of persons in the Godhead: in a future Lecture it will be shown, that this angel, who when sent on errands to man so solemnly and frequently asserted his Deity, was the Son of God, appearing in human form, anticipating as it were his incarnation,† and fulfilling the office, which he had taken upon himself before the foundation of the world,—that of Mediator between God and man.

Turn to Gen. xvi. 7, 13. There "the angel of the Lord" appears to Hagar, and says, "*I will multiply thy seed exceedingly;*" and Hagar "*called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, Thou God seest me.*" Again, in Gen. xxii. 11, 12, "*The angel of the Lord called me to him out of heaven, and said, Abraham, Abraham: and he said, Here am I. And he said, Lay not thine hand upon the lad, neither do thou any thing unto him: for now I know that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son, from me.*" In Gen. xxxi. 11, 13. "*The angel of God*" speaks unto Jacob in a dream, and says, "*I am the God of Bethel.*"—And in the following chapter Jacob wrestles with "*a man,*" who puts his thigh out of joint with a touch, who refuses to give his name, but tells Jacob that he had had "*power with God and with men.*" When it is all over, his own comment on the affair is, "*I have seen God face to face;*" and the prophet Hosea's is "*By his strength he had power with God: yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed—he wept and made supplication unto him—he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us; even the Lord God of Hosts; the Lord is his memorial.*" Ch. xii. 3, 5. So that the person Jacob wrestled with was in the form of a *man*, an angel or messenger *sent by some one*, and *the Lord of Hosts*. Well might Jacob on his death-bed ascribe his daily preservation and sustenance to this Angel Jehovah, saying, "God, before whom my fathers, Abraham

\* Read to the end of the chapter.

† Incarnation means entering the flesh, taking upon him human nature.

and Isaac, did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, *the Angel* which redeemed\* me from all evil, bless the lads." Gen. xxviii. 15, 16. Again, in Ex. iii. 2, 6, "The angel of the Lord" appears to Moses in the burning bush, and says, "I am *the God* of thy father;" and in Judges ii. 1, "An *angel* of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, *I* made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you into the land which *I* swear unto your fathers."

Two passages from the book of Daniel will conclude this part of the argument.

"Dan. iv. 26. 'And whereas **THEY** commanded to leave the stump of the tree-roots,' &c. At the 13th verse of this chapter we read only of one *watcher* or *holy one* coming down from heaven, of whom it is said that **HE** cried—*leave the stump of his roots in the earth*. Yet the number is here very remarkably changed from *he* said to *they* commanded. And though the words of the curse upon *Nebuchadnezzar* were pronounced by A *watcher* and An *holy one* in the singular; nevertheless, at the close of the speech, this *matter* is declared to be by the *decree of the WATCHERS, and the demand by the word of the HOLY ONES*. (Compare this with Prov. ix. 10.) Now it is very certain that the judgments of God are not founded upon the *decree* and *word* of Angels, or of any created beings: therefore this *watcher* could be no created angel, but a person in the Lord *Jehovah*, who condescends to *watch over* (Jer. xxxi. 28) his people, and is called the *keeper of Israel, that neither slumbereth nor sleepeth*. The change of these verbs and nouns from the singular to the plural, can be accounted for upon no other principle: it is a case to which there is no parallel in any language, and such as can be reconcileable only to the being of *God*, who is *one* and *many*. We are to collect from it, that in this, as in every act of the Godhead, there was a consent and concurrence of the persons in the Trinity; and though there was *one* only who *spake*, it was the *word* and *decree of all*.

"Dan. v. 18 20. 'The most high God gave to *Nebuchadnezzar* thy father a kingdom and majesty and *glory* and honour. And **THEY** took his *glory* from him.' Here again the word *they* is a plain relative to the *most high God*. Nor can it otherwise be agreeable to the sense of the history, or the reason of the thing itself, considered as a matter of fact. For who was it that *took away* the *glory* of the king? It was not the work of *men*, but a supernatural act of the *most high God*; to whom *Nebuchadnezzar* himself hath ascribed it—*those that walk in pride HE is able to abase*."†

\* It would not be to the purpose to press the full meaning of this expression; any meaning will equally well suit our present argument.

† Jones on the Trinity.

(To be continued.)

## LECTURE VIII.

### THE TRINITY.

(CONTINUED.)

Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. *Matt. xxviii. 19.*

HAVING proved our first point, namely, the plurality of persons in the Godhead, the next question is, How can it be shewn that the number of persons is *three*, and no more; in other words, that God is a *Trinity*? We reply, that one person is spoken of under the name of the Father, a second under the name of the Son, a third under the name of the Spirit; and that no mention is made of any others. On the Godhead of the Father we need say nothing. The proof of the Son's Godhead will be given at large in the lecture on the Deity of Christ. Not to pass it over entirely, however, we will just refer to one passage in the Old Testament, which speaks of the Son without reference to his future incarnation: "Serve *the Lord* with fear and rejoice with trembling. Kiss *the Son* lest he be angry, and ye perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in him." Psalm ii. 11, 12. Now, without pressing the connection between "serve the Lord" and "kiss the Son," compare the words "blessed are all they that put their trust in him" with the solemn warning in Jer. xvii. 5, "Cursed be the man *that trusteth in man*, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord," and you will have what the Unitarian may, if he likes, call an *inference* about the person of the Son—but such a one as cannot well be mistaken.\*

Before passing on, a word or two may be useful on the eternal sonship of Christ. It is argued that a son must come into existence *after* the father who begat him; therefore, that the Son of God cannot be co-eternal with the Father. Now

\* The following passage, though not a direct proof of the Son's Deity is too remarkable to be omitted: "Who hath gathered the wind in his fists? Who hath bound the waters in a garment? Who hath established all the ends of the earth? What is his name, *and what is his Son's name*, if thou canst tell?" Prov. xxx. 4.

observe that, even if this were granted, it would not touch the question of the Son's *Deity*; for some have believed his Deity, and denied his eternal sonship. They hold, that Christ is called the Son of God, either in virtue of his miraculous conception, or of his resurrection from the dead, or of the office he has undertaken in the plan of Salvation; and therefore, that although co-equal and co-eternal with the Father as one person in the ever-blessed Trinity, yet he was not eternally *the Son of God*, except in purpose, but became so afterwards. Most Christians however hold, that in addition to those reasons the second person of the Trinity is in scripture called the Son, and the first the Father,\* as giving the nearest idea, which our minds are capable of receiving, of the relationship they have borne to one another from eternity. This is what Unitarians consider absurd and impossible. Now however difficult it may be for our minds to conceive the idea of an eternal Son, it cannot be more difficult than to conceive the idea of an eternal Father; for no one *can* conceive it: the very idea of *eternity* is beyond the power of any created intellect to grasp. What folly then to argue against possibilities in the nature of the Infinite Jehovah, from the weakness of our own finite minds! Waiving however for a time the unfathomable mystery of God's eternity, which I believe no Unitarian denies, a simple illustration will shew that there is no such difficulty as is supposed in the begetter and the begotten being of the same age. Flame begets light; flame is the father, light is the son: yet they come into existence exactly at the same time. Light is begotten simultaneously with the flame that begets it; you cannot produce one an instant before the other.—All earthly illustrations of Divine things must be imperfect; but this may perhaps give some little help in removing a stumbling-block out of the way of weak faith, though it is far from doing away with the necessity of faith. At the best we can only "see through a glass darkly:" but we make the darkness thicker than it really is, if we forget how very imperfect *any* human words must be when applied to the nature of God. We must not suppose that the first and second persons of the Trinity are Father and Son *in the same way that we are*; but only that the words are used, as I said before, to give the nearest idea, which our minds are capable of receiving, of the relationship between them. To say that that idea must necessarily be indistinct, is only to say that he is God, and we are men. To reject revealed truth on this account is no less impious than *irrational*.

\* Observe, that the entire Godhead is called the Father, as being the Creator of all things; and the first person in the Godhead is called the Father in reference to his relationship to the second person.



Leaving then the main proof of the Deity of the Son to a future lecture, we proceed to that of the third\* person in the Trinity—the Holy Spirit. Here we are under some disadvantage, as it is so very difficult to find out *what* Unitarians *do* suppose the Spirit to be. If however we prove from Scripture, 1st, That the Spirit is God; and 2ndly, That it is not merely another name given to God, but is a distinct person from either the Father or the Son—it will be all that is required. First, therefore, in proof of his *Godhead* take the following passages: “The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life.” Job xxxiii. 4. “And the angel answered and said unto her, The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God. Luke i. 35. In the next chapter we read, that it was revealed “to Simeon” *by the Holy Ghost*, that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord’s Christ”; and when Simeon does see him, he says “Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace *according to thy word*.” Again, in Matt. ix. 38, our Lord bids his disciples, “Pray ye therefore *the Lord of the harvest* that *he would send forth* labourers into his harvest”; and in Acts xiii. 2, we read that “as they ministered to the Lord and fasted, *the Holy Ghost* said, Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto *I* have called them”: therefore “the Holy Ghost” is “the Lord of the harvest.” In the 5th ch. of the Acts, Peter rebukes the sin of Ananias, saying, “Why hath Satan filled thine heart to lie to *the Holy Ghost*? \* \* \* Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God.” Lastly, in Acts xxviii. 25, St Paul declares that “*the Holy Ghost* spake by the mouth of Esaias the prophet,” and in Acts i. 16, St. Peter declares that *the Holy Ghost* “spake by the mouth of David;” while in Heb. i. 1, we read that “God at sundry times and in divers manners *spake* in times past unto our fathers *by the prophets*,” and in 2 Tim. iii. 16, that “*All Scripture* is given by inspiration of God.” Now Mr. Barker writes, “We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and the Spirit is the gift of God.” No doubt he is; but if the writer means to say that because the Spirit is a gift he cannot be a person, I would, remind him that the Son is also a gift; (God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son to be the propitiation for their sins); and I would ask, what sort of a gift it is, which made Job, which is the Lord of the harvest, which spake by the Prophets, and to which Ananias lied!

Against the second Unitarian theory, which admits the *Deity*, but denies the *distinct Personality* of the Spirit, and considers it

\* The Father, the Son, and the Spirit are called the first, second, and third persons, not to denote any inferiority of rank, but merely for the convenience of distinction,

to be merely another name applied either to God, or else to some power, operation, or quality belonging to God, the following passages may be brought. "And now the Lord God, *and* his Spirit, hath sent me." Is. xlviii 16. "And the Holy Ghost descended *in a bodily shape* like a dove upon him, and a voice came from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased." Luke iii. 22. "Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, *and* of the Holy Ghost." Matt. xxviii. 19. "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, *and* the communion of the Holy Ghost." 2 Cor. xiii. 14. The most important testimony however, and one which, if there were not another in the Bible, would be amply sufficient with any reasonable man to set the whole question at rest, is given in one of our Lord's last addresses to his disciples, related in the 14th and two following chapters of St. John's gospel. "And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you *another Comforter*, that *he* may abide with you for ever; even *the Spirit* of truth; *whom* the world cannot receive, because it seeth *him* not, neither knoweth *him*; but ye know *him*; for *he* dwelleth with you, and shall be in you. \* \* \* \* But the Comforter, which is *the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send* in my name, *he* shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you. \* \* \* \* But when the Comforter is come, *whom* I will send unto you *from the Father*, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, *he* shall testify of me. \* \* \* \* If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I depart, I will send *him* unto you; and when *he* is come, *he* will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment. \* \* \* \* Howbeit, when *he*, the Spirit of truth is come, *he* will guide you into all truth, for *he* shall not speak of *himself*; but whatsoever *he* shall hear, that shall *he* speak, and *he* shall show you things to come. *He* shall glorify me, for *he* shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you. All things that the Father hath are mine; therefore said I, that *he* shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you." Surely, if we "take Christ as our teacher," which is Mr. Barker's definition of a Christian, all argument must be at end with regard to the Spirit's distinct Personality. Every one of the marked words is as emphatic in the original, as in the translation.

Having thus shown, to borrow Mr. Barker's words some years back, "that the Scriptures uniformly speak of the Father as God, the Son as God, and the Holy Ghost as God," we have only to add, what every one will allow, that they never assert the Deity of *any other person*, while they positively assert that there is *but one God*,—and the proof of the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity is complete; as complete, to any one who is willing just to learn "the mind of the Spirit" from his own word, as if the Athanasian creed had been drawn up by

Christ himself. But as Unitarians harp so much upon the doctrine not being taught *in single texts*, let us direct their attention to one or two, although we must beg leave most strongly to protest against this habit of dictating to God how truth ought to be taught us. If it required a hundred texts to be compared together in order to prove any doctrine, we should be as much bound to believe it, as if it was flatly stated in every one of them.

Turn then to Deut. vi. 4. "Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord." Now in the original there is no word 'is,' and the word 'one' comes at the last by itself: so that the exact, and only allowable, translation is "Jehovah \* our God Jehovah one;" or, if the word 'is' be understood, "Jehovah our God Jehovah (is) one." To put 'Jehovah' after 'one,' by translating it as in our Bible "Jehovah our God is one Jehovah," is doing utter violence to the language, and destroying the whole force of the expression. What then is the meaning of this threefold mention of God's name, followed by the single word 'one?' Jehovah, our God, Jehovah—One.

The next passage is Num. vi. 22—27. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, speak unto Aaron and unto his sons, saying, On this wise ye shall bless the children of Israel, saying unto them, The Lord bless thee, and keep thee: The Lord make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: The Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace. And they shall put *my name* upon the children of Israel; and I will bless them." Now although we admit that such passages as this and others like it, would not be in themselves positive and direct proof of the Trinity, yet, *having* proved it from other clear testimonies of Scripture, we cannot doubt for a moment that a reference to it was intended in them. "If the three articles of this benediction be attentively considered," says an able writer, "their contents will be found to agree respectively to the three persons taken in the usual order of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The Father is the author of *blessing* and *preservation*. *Grace* and *illumination* are from the Son, by whom we have "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God, in the face of Jesus Christ." *Peace* is the gift of the Spirit, whose name is the Comforter, and whose first and best fruit is the work of Peace." By pronouncing this *threefold* blessing, which was yet but *one* blessing, the Priest "put God's *name* upon" the children of Israel;†

\* When the word 'LORD' is printed thus in capitals in our Bible, it is always in the original 'Jehovah.'

† Whether true or not, it is very remarkable, that the Jews to this day have a tradition, that when the High Priest pronounced this blessing, he lifted up his hands, and placed his fingers in the form of a Triad or Trinity.

which answers the argument brought against us from the words "There shall be one Lord, and *his name one*;" for we are here taught that *his name is also three*. This is just what we contend for—that his name is both three and one; in other words, Tri-une, or a Trinity in Unity.

And now let us ask, If the Jew had the Triune name of God thus "put upon" him in solemn blessing, is it likely that the Christian should be without the honour of having it put upon him? No; rather should we expect it be done with even more distinctness than under the twilight dispensation of Judaism. And is it not so? "Go ye and teach all nations" was the Saviour's last command to his disciples, "baptising them *in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*." Do Unitarians have the Triune name of God thus "put upon" themselves and their children, either in infancy or later years? Do they in this instance follow "the teaching of Christ," and submit to be baptised "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?" Or would it be too palpable a recognition of the doctrine of the Trinity? would it be too perplexing a question to answer, when their children in time to come should say unto them, "What mean ye by this ordinance?" If they do not, surely the words which follow should convince them that, if there be no danger in denying the Trinity *theoretically*, there must be considerable danger in denying it practically; "He that believeth *and is baptised* shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be damned."

A stronger proof of the doctrine of the Trinity than the form of Christian baptism can scarcely be conceived. Only think of our being dedicated in this solemn ordinance conjointly to the Creator, to a creature, and to a power, property or influence! Observe too, that it is not "in the *names*," but "in the *name*"; three persons, yet one name—God. In confirmation of this we may refer to Acts xix. 1. 6. St Paul asks certain disciples at Ephesus, whether they had received the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost since they believed. To which they reply "We have not so much as heard, whether there be any Holy Ghost." "Unto what then," he asks, "were ye baptised? How can you be Christians, without having been instructed in the doctrine of the Trinity? was not the very form of your baptism a confession of it?" This difficulty is removed by their explaining that they had only been baptised unto John's baptism; which required nothing more than a general profession of repentance. But Paul reminds them, that John only represented himself as the forerunner of one who was to come after him, and whom he bid his disciples be-

\* Nor must we omit the Apostolic blessing, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all." 2 Cor. xiii. 14.

lieve in. "When they heard this; they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus." We cannot suppose for a moment, that the Apostle disobeyed his master's command, to baptise "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" the expression "they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus" answers exactly to our expression—"they received *Christian* baptism;" meaning that they were baptised into Christ's Church, and of course in the way Christ ordered. Indeed, unless they were baptised in the name of the Holy Ghost, what force can there be in St. Paul's question, on finding their ignorance concerning his person—"Unto what then were ye baptised?"

Now hear the song of the Seraphim; "Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts." Is. vi. 3. In the same strain they are heard by St. John crying "Holy, Holy, Holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come." Rev. iii. 8. With regard to the scene of glory witnessed by Isaiah, we know from John xii. 41, that the glory manifested was that of *the Son*; for after shewing that the blindness of the Jews under *Christ's* teaching was a fulfilment of the prophecy spoken *on that occasion*, St. John adds, "These things spake Esaias, when he saw *his* glory, and spake of *him*." We also know from Acts xxviii. 25, that it was *the Holy Ghost*, who spoke to Isaiah by the name of *the Lord of Hosts*: so that we need be at no loss to understand the meaning of that three-fold song, which then resounded in heaven—"Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hosts."

Lastly, we refer to the famous passage, "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one."\* 1 John v. 7. On this I content myself with quoting the following remarks of a learned writer on the Trinity, William Jones. The capitals and italics are his own. "There has been much disputing about the authenticity of this text. I firmly believe it to be genuine for the following reasons: 1. St. *Jerome*, who had a better opportunity of examining the true merits of the cause than we can possibly have at this distance of time, tells us

\* The following extract from Mr. Slade's comment on this text presents an argument in favour of it almost conclusive to the author's mind; although of course the mere English reader will not be able to appreciate it. "Many have justly observed, that if it be rejected, the construction becomes wholly unaccountable: in the phrase 'There are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit, and the water, and the blood,' the adjective and participle are both masculine, whereas all the substantives to which they refer are neuter; and one of those substantives (the only one of them, to say the most, which could have authorised the use of the masculine gender) is actually constructed in the preceding verse with a neuter participle. Now, although it is scarcely possible to reconcile this on any ground, with the plain rules of grammar; yet the error may be accounted for, by supposing it to have proceeded from a repetition of the phraseology of the disputed passage; or from, what grammarians call, the figure of attraction."

plainly, that he found out how it had been adulterated, mis-translated, and omitted on purpose to elude the truth. 2. The Divines of *Lovain* having compared many *Latin* copies, found this text wanting but in five of them; and *R. Stephens* found it retained in nine of sixteen ancient manuscripts which he used. 3. It is *certainly* quoted twice by *St. Cyprian*, who wrote before the council of *Nice*; and also by *Tertullian*. *Dr. Clarke*, therefore, is *not to be believed* when he tells us, it was 'never cited by any of the *Latins* before *St. Jerome*.' 4. The sense is not perfect without it, there being a contrast of three witnesses in heaven to three upon earth; the *Father*, the *Word*, and the *Holy Ghost*, whose testimony is called the *witness of God*; and the *Spirit*, the *water*, and the *blood*, which, being administered by the Church upon earth, is called the *witness of men*. He that desires to see this text farther vindicated from the malice of *Faustus Socinus*, may consult *Pool's Synopsis*, and *Dr. Hammond*; and I wish he would also read what has lately been published upon it by my good and learned friend *Dr. Delany*, in his volume of *Sermons*, p. 69, &c. But even allowing it to be spurious, it contains nothing but what is abundantly asserted elsewhere; and that both with regard to the Trinity in general, and this their divine *Testimony* in particular. For that there are *three* divine persons who bear record to the Mission of Christ, is evident from the following Scriptures: *John* vii. 17, 18. *The Testimony of two men is true. I am ONE that bear witness of MYSELF. The FATHER that sent me beareth witness of me. I John, v. 6. It is the SPIRIT that beareth witness.* And Christ has also mentioned upon another occasion a *plurality* of witnesses in heaven.—We *speak*, says he, *that we do know, and testify that we have seen, and ye receive not OUR Witness!* which can be no other than the *witness* of the *Trinity*; because it is added—*no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven*; therefore no *man* could join with *Christ* in revealing the things of heaven to us."

All that remains for us now is to notice the assertion so often made by Unitarians, that the doctrine of the Trinity, even if true, is a useless doctrine; that it can have no practical effect upon the heart and life. I have no remark of *Mr. Barker's* on this subject in print before me; but a respectable person, who was present at one of his late lectures in the Potteries, tells me that the following was his style of argument: "Of what use can such a doctrine be to any one? Can it make a bad man good, or a good man better? Can it make any one leave off sin and turn to God? Suppose I met a drunkard for instance in the street, and said to him, Now, my man, this is a very bad habit you've fallen into; it's very wrong to get drunk; you know God is a Trinity in Unity, three persons and one

God; so you must become sober, and not be so wicked as to get drunk any more—would it be likely to have any effect upon him?" This peculiar method of arguing, which so frequently occurs in the writings of the person just alluded to, always raises a doubt in my mind, whether I ought to follow the 4th or the 5th verse of the 26th ch. of Proverbs. There's a double danger; either of being led to say any thing that might look like bitter feeling towards the man, or of appearing to speak irreverently on so sacred a subject. But as the simplest and most effectual way of exposing the palpable sophistry of such an argument, only imagine a medical man, endeavouring in a public lecture to shew the uselessness of a certain drug as a medicine, and speaking thus: "Of what use can it be to any one? Can it cure a sick man, or make a healthy man stronger? Suppose I met a man in the street, and I said to him, Now, my man, you're evidently very ill; I've got an excellent medicine here; just let me rub a little of it *in your eye*!—would it do him any good?"\* All the sensible persons present would probably walk out of the room at once; the ignorant would laugh and think what a clever hit it was; while, if any opponent thought it worth replying to, he would tell him that, however valuable a medicine may be, it must be *properly applied*, or it can do no good; and further, that different diseases require different remedies. Having already given my opinion rather plainly in the preceding lecture on a very similar controversial manœuvre, I will only just put these questions to Mr. Barker's conscience, and his hearers' judgments—Did he, when he used those words, *believe* that any Trinitarian ever applied that doctrine in any such way? Did he not *know* what use they *do* make of it? And if so, was it not a wilful attempt to deceive men's souls "with feigned words?" If throughout the whole course of his Trinitarian ministry, he never did learn the true value and use of the doctrine of the Trinity, no wonder he was led on at length to disbelieve and deny it. Every enlightened believer however knows full well, that on the Trinity rests Christ's Deity, and on that his Atonement. What effect *this* has upon the hearts and lives of all who are led by the Spirit to rest upon it with a living faith, he knows both from Scripture and experience. He can testify "that the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin;" nor dare he shrink from adding, "Neither is there Salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

\* Mr. Barker lays great stress on believing "that Jesus is the Christ;" but suppose I met a drunkard and said to him, "Now you must leave off this wicked practice and be sober, for you know Jesus is the Christ—would it be likely to reform him?"

"As the *doctrine of the Trinity*" writes Dr. Whately "may be considered as containing a summary and compendium of the Christian *faith*, so its *application* may be regarded as a summary of Christian *practice*: which may be said to be comprised in this; that as we believe God to stand in *three relations* to us, we also must practically keep in view the *three corresponding relations* in which, as is plainly implied by that doctrine, we stand towards HIM,—as first the *creatures and children of God*; secondly, as the *redeemed and purchased people of Jesus Christ*; and thirdly, as the *temples of the Holy Ghost our Sanctifier*."

---

## APPENDIX.

(*Extracted from the Preface to the seventh of the Liverpool Lectures on Unitarianism.*)

The word Trinity is of more ancient date than the public may happen to know. It is found in the writings of Justin Martyr, who was converted to the Christian Faith, about the year of our Lord 140. But that he was the *inventor* of the word is more than any one can prove. He was for some time contemporary with Polycarp and Papias, two disciples of the Apostle St. John. And it is not improbable that he found the word in use with them. However that may have been, it is a fact, that between the death of St. John and the conversion of Justin Martyr, there intervened only 46 years. This brings the use of the word within half a century of the Apostolic age. And to assert that the word was not in use until it was written, is to assert a little too much: And to suppose that it was used and written without any meaning is still more absurd.

The next who makes use of the word in his writings is Theophilus, a Gentile convert, who was appointed Bishop of Antioch, in the year of our Lord 170, about 30 years after the conversion of Justin Martyr. The word occurs in his second book addressed to Antolycus.

Next to Theophilus, is Clemens of Alexandria, who was originally a philosopher, and is said to have been converted to the Christian Faith about the year 194, and so to have flourished 25 years later than Theophilus. He introduces the word Trinity in the third book of his *Stromata*.

Tertullian, Bishop of Carthage, who was converted to Christianity about the year 200, follows Clemens in the use of the word. He had occasion to introduce it in his work against Praxeas, in which he defended the fundamental doctrines of Christianity against the heartless attacks of that noted heretic.

Origen, who had been the scholar of Clemens of Alexandria, flourished about the year 280, and used similar language with his master in reference to the Trinity. He is accused of having being the first to mix up the reve-



ries of the Platonists with the solemn truths of Christianity, but this charge cannot apply to the introduction of the word Trinity, as that word was in use in the Christian Church nearly a hundred years before his time, if not much longer.

To furnish any more examples of the use of the word *Trinity* in the primitive Church, would be superfluous: but to bring forward a few testimonies to show that the doctrine intended by that word, was held and taught in the earliest ages of the Christian era, cannot be unimportant: for though this doctrine is a matter of pure revelation, and must consequently derive its proofs exclusively from Scripture, yet the Christian feels a degree of satisfaction to learn that the view he takes of the doctrine was that of the Church of Christ from the beginning.

A proof of the Divinity of Christ has been always considered decisive in establishing the doctrine of the Trinity, because all who have admitted the former have also admitted the latter. We premise this remark, because some of the testimonies which we shall adduce bear more fully on that point as the turning one of the doctrine.

Polycarp, a disciple of St. John, when at the stake, addressed a prayer to God which he concluded in this manner: "*For all things I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee, together with the eternal and heavenly Jesus Christ: with whom, unto thee, and the Holy Spirit, be glory, both now and for ever, world without end, Amen.*" Polycarp was a contemporary of the Apostles.

Justyn Martyr declares, "that Christ, the first-born Word of God, *exists as God; that he is Lord and God, being the Son of God; and that he was the God of Israel.*" Again he says,—"*HIM (the Father) and that Son who hath proceeded from him, and the PROPHETICAL SPIRIT, we worship and adore.*" He flourished in the year 140.

Melito, Bishop of Sardis, says—"We are worshippers of one God, who is before all, and in all, in *his Christ who is truly God, the Eternal Word.*" He flourished in the year 177.

Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, declares that "Christ, as God, was adored by the Prophets; *was the God of the living, and the living God; that he spake to Moses in the bush; and that the same person afterwards refuted the doctrine of the Sadducees concerning the resurrection of the dead:—He farther says, that Abraham learned divine truth from the Logos, or Word of God.*" He flourished in the year 178.

Athenagoras says:—"The Mind and Word of God is the Son of God: We, who preach *God, preach God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one.*" He flourished in the year 178.

Clement of Alexandria, says,—"*The Logos is the Universal Architect, that is the Maker of all things. The Logos is the Creator of men, and of the world: and in prayer he addresses both the Son and the Father, saying, —'Son and Father, both one Lord, grant that we may praise the Son, and the Father, with the Holy Ghost, ALL IN ONE.'*" He flourished in the year 194.

Tertullian says:—"The name of Christ is every where believed, and every where worshipped. *He reigns every where, and is every where adored. He is alike to all a King, and to all a Judge, AND TO ALL A GOD AND A LORD.*" He flourished in the year 200.

Origen states, that the Christians were accustomed to say,—"*The Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, are one God,*" and speaks of this as a difficult and perplexing doctrine to such as hear not with faith." Again he observes:—"When we come to the grace of baptism, *we acknowledge one God only, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.*" He flourished in the year 230.

Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, says,—"*Christ is our God; that is, not of all, but of the faithful and believing.*" He flourished in the year 248.

The Council of Antioch, in its Epistle, states :—" *In the whole Church Christ is believed to be God ; and man of the seed of David according to the flesh.*" This Council sat in 264.

The Council of Arles expressed its opinion on the subject of the Trinity, by declaring the baptism of such as refused to own that doctrine to be void. In a Canon drawn up concerning the proper mode of dealing with heretics on their return to the bosom of the Church, the Council put forth the general sense of the Church, in words to this effect :—" That if any relinquished their heresy, and came back to the Church, they should ask them the Creed ; and if they found that they were (had been) baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they should only receive imposition of hands, *but if they did not confess the Trinity, their baptism was declared void.*" This Council was held in the year 314.

---

*(From Tupper's Proverbial Philosophy.)*

LIKE begetteth like, and the spreading tree of being  
 With each of its trefoil leaves pointeth at the trinity of God.  
 Let him whose eyes have been unfilmed, read this homily in all things,  
 And then, of duller sight, despise not him that readeth :  
 There be three grand principles ; life, generation, and obedience ;  
 Shadowing in every creature, the Spirit, and the Father, and the Son.  
 There be three grand unities, variously mixed in trinities,  
 Three catholic divisors of the million sums of matter :  
 Yea, though science hath not seen it, climbing the ladder of experiment,  
 Let faith, in the presence of her God, promulgate the mighty truth ;  
 Of three sole elements all nature's works consist :  
 The pine, and the rock to which it clingeth, and the eagle sailing around it ;  
 The lion, and the northern whale, and the deeps wherein he sporteth ;  
 The lizard sleeping in the sun ; the lightning flashing from a cloud ;  
 The rose, and the ruby, and the pearl ; each one is made of three ;  
 And the three be the like ingredients, mingled in divers measures.  
 Thyself hast within thyself body, and life and mind :  
 Matter, and breath, and instinct, unite in all beasts of the field ;  
 Substance, coherence, and weight, fashion the fabrics of the earth ;  
 The will, the doing, and the deed, combine to form a fact :  
 The stem, the leaf, and the flower ; beginning, middle, and end ;  
 Cause, circumstance, consequent ; and every three is one.  
 Yea, the very breath of man's life consisteth of a trinity of vapours,  
 And the noonday light is a compound, the triune shadow of Jehovah.  
 Shall all things else be in mystery, and God alone be understood ?  
 Shall finite fathom infinity, though it sound not the shallows of creation ?  
 Shall a man comprehend his Maker, being yet a riddle to himself ?  
 Or time teach the lesson that eternity cannot master ?  
 If God be nothing more than one, a child can compass the thought ;  
 But seraphs fail to unravel the wondrous unity of three.  
 One verily He is, for there can be but one who is all mighty ;  
 Yet the oracles of nature and religion proclaim Him three in one.  
 And where were the value to thy soul, O miserable denizen of earth,  
 Of the idle pageant of the cross, where hung no sacrifice for thee ?  
 Where the worth to thine impotent heart, of that stirred Bethesda,  
 All numbed and palsied as it is, by the scorpion stings of sin ?  
 No, thy trinity of nature, enchained by treble death,  
 Helplessly craveth of its God, Himself for three salvations :  
 The soul to be reconciled in love, the mind to be glorified in light  
 While this poor dying body leapeth into life.

## LECTURE IX.

### THE FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD; ESPECIALLY IN REFERENCE TO THE MESSIAHSHIP OR CHRISTHOOD OF JESUS.

The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy. Rev. xix. 10.

THE title of this lecture may perhaps surprise some of my readers. Does any one really deny, that God foreknew that Jesus would be the Messiah? You may well ask the question. I confess, that of all the marvellous things I ever met with, nothing astounded me so much as the first perusal of Mr. Barker's remarks on this subject. The absurdities and inconsistencies of Atheism, Deism, Mahommedanism, or any other *ism*, absolutely sink into nothing by the side of such an overwhelming mystery, as the fact of a man well read in Scripture, allowing its truth (even in the loosest sense of the word,) and yet denying the foreknowledge of God;—above all, with respect to the person and office of Jesus Christ. Yet so it is. Not only does he deny our Lord's Deity, his Pre-existence, and his miraculous conception, but he actually asserts, that God did not know at the time of his birth, whether he would turn out a good man or a bad man; that he did not know, until he had tried him, whether he would do for the Messiah or not; that Jesus was never prophesied of as an individual; that it is quite possible God may have tried many other persons before to see if they would answer his purpose for the Messiah; and that there is no means by which he *can* know, how a free agent will act under any given circumstances, except by trying him! What a proof of the depth of folly, into which man's boasted reason will sink, when left to itself!—and that by the very attempt to assert its own wisdom! Human reason cannot reconcile God's foreknowledge with man's free agency; and therefore, instead of bowing before the difficulty and confessing its blindness, it must stand up for its own dignity, and boldly deny the possibility of it. What a warning does this give us against the infidel principle of rejecting every thing that cannot be reconciled to human reason. For nothing, but a blind determination to stick to this principle at whatever cost, could have hurried any one into such a monstrous absurdity, or such a daring assault on the throne of the Almighty. The doctrine of God's foreknow-

ledge is far from a merely speculative point, as some assert. Deny it—and what becomes of all the *prophecies* in scripture? They must be a tissue of impostures: for how can anything be *foretold*, if it is not *foreknown*? Let us then examine the general grounds on which this doctrine is rejected, before we consider its particular application to the person of Jesus Christ.

The main argument brought forward against it is, that it is irreconcilable with man's free agency: "I don't see *how* God *can* foreknow the moral actions of free agents" are, as near as I can remember, Mr. Barker's very words. All such "imaginings," and "high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God," we have already endeavoured in Lecture III. to "cast down" with the "spiritual weapons" of God's word. We shall therefore only remind you again of the answer, which St. Paul gives to *this very objection*, supposed to be made *against this very doctrine*. From the 10th to the 18th verses of the 9th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, he has been proving (to say the least) the *Foreknowledge* of God; and then, seeing its apparent inconsistency with man's free agency and responsibility, he supposes some one to object—"Why doth he (God) yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?" Or, to put it in its modern form—"If God knows that I shall commit a particular sin, it must be certain that I shall commit it; and if so, I can't help committing it; and if I can't help it, there can be no fault or sin in the act: not being a free agent, I cannot be responsible." This is the sort of reasoning we continually hear, precisely agreeing with the Apostle's words, "Why doth he yet find fault? For who hath resisted his will?" And now what answer does he give to it? Does he enter into any deep metaphysical argument, to show how God's Foreknowledge *can* be reconciled to man's free agency, to remove all the difficulties out of our way, and make it plain and simple to human reason? No such thing! He gives what we have all along said is the only proper answer to such "imaginings"—"Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God?"\* I know that learned men have said

\* Probably the most remarkable specimen of scriptural interpretation, which the theological literature of any age or country could afford, is the view taken by Mr. Barker of this chapter. According to him, St. Paul's object was to shew, that God's promises and threats are all conditional, and "that God has a *right*"—to do what?—to reward and punish men according to their works! That God certainly does so, and has a right to do so, I suppose no one will deny; but will any one be kind enough just to read the chapter through, and bear in mind (especially at verse 11 and 16), that *this is the drift of the Apostle's argument*? Will you further ask yourself, how St. Paul could ever imagine any one to object against such a doctrine, "Why doth he yet find fault? for who hath resisted his will?" Just fancy a minister preaching on the doctrine, that God's promises and threats are conditional, that God has a right to regulate his own treatment of any person by that person's conduct,—and some one objecting, that *such a statement was inconsistent with man's responsibility*!

a great deal, and perhaps a great deal more might be said, to explain away the difficulties connected with this subject: but when all has been said that can be said, there *will* remain difficulties to a reflecting mind; and you will find yourself at last obliged to be content with leaving the matter just where the Apostle left it. Scripture distinctly asserts both the entire Foreknowledge of God and the entire responsibility of man; and therefore to all difficulties, as to *how* these things can be, we need only say—"Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliest against God." The more deeply any enlightened Christian has attempted to dive into this mystery, the more thoroughly he will be convinced, that it is impossible ever to *untie* the knot, that it must after all be *cut*—either in St. Paul's way, by "casting down" man's "imagination" with the Word of God, or in Mr. Barker's way, by casting down the Word of God with man's imaginations.

The doctrine of Predestination is always brought forward in connection with Foreknowledge; but with this the present Lecture has nothing whatever to do. Even orthodox Christians here differ so much amongst themselves, that I feel it would be unwise to say anything; though few probably could agree with Mr. Barker, "that some things, predestined by God, *never come to pass*"! On the subject of Predestination, I would humbly advise my readers to think more than argue, and pray more than think: above all, never to look at it, but in the light in which Scripture presents it. Remember, you may be blinded by looking at the sun with your naked eye; but through a coloured glass you may gaze on it without hurt or inconvenience. The Bible is this glass. Through it "the deep things of God" are presented to us in such a light, as we are able to bear. All we have to do is, to pray for heavenly guidance, that we may "spiritually discern" them; then just take them, as they are there stated, without regard to any consequence that may appear to be involved in them; and leave God to vindicate his own ways.

The whole of the remaining part of Mr. Barker's reasoning about Foreknowledge (at least as far as I have seen) may be summed up in the cases of Eli, and of Nineveh. In the first of these, God promises a blessing to the family of Eli, which they forfeit by transgression; in the second, he threatens Nineveh with a punishment, which they avert by repentance. "Here," says Mr. Barker, "the thing predestinated and foretold did not take place." We reply, that they were neither *predestined* nor *foretold*; they were *promised* and *threatened*: and the non-fulfilment of them only showed that in both cases a condition was implied, though not expressed. The only possible argument therefore, which can be drawn from these, and similar passages against the Foreknowledge of God, is, that all prophecies are but conditional promises or threats:

a position so palpably absurd, that no one surely would venture upon it. This will be seen at once, when we come to instance a few of them.

But before doing so, another text must be noticed, which at first sight seems much more to the purpose, though I never remember seeing it brought forward; "And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent, when they see war, and they return to Egypt." Ex. xiii. 17. The "peradventure" here might very naturally lead us to infer, that God did not know whether they would repent or not; but we have only to look at a few other passages, to see at once, that such a way of drawing an inference would lead us very far astray. Take four. "And the Lord *came down* to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded." Gen. xi. 5. "And the Lord said, Because the cry of Sodom and Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I will *go down* now, and *see whether they have done* altogether according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I will know." Gen. xviii. 20, 21. "If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then I will spare all the place for their sakes." Gen. xviii. 26. "For *now I know*, that thou fearest God, seeing thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me." Gen. xxii. 12. Now the first of these passages would seem naturally to imply, that God had to *come down*, in order to see the tower; the second, that he had to come down, in order to ascertain whether the report that had reached him of the doings at Sodom was true; the third, that at the time he was speaking to Abraham he did not know, whether there were fifty righteous in Sodom or not; and the fourth, that he did not know until that event, whether Abraham feared him or not: \* all quite as obviously as the word "peradventure" in Ex. xiii. 17, implies, that he did not know whether the Israelites would repent or not. Do you admit all those inferences? Certainly not, you say; other Scriptures will not allow us to do so: in these cases, God no doubt spoke, to use St. Paul's words, "after the manner of men." Exactly: and just so other Scriptures, which prove God's entire Foreknowledge of all things, will not allow us to admit an inference contrary to it from *this* passage. To a few of these Scriptures then we shall now direct your attention.

\* A careless reader might think, that this text supported Mr. Barker's theory about Foreknowledge; but if it proves anything, it would prove that God could not without trying him, tell the state of Abraham's heart *at the present time*. The trial did not shew, whether Abraham *would* fear God at some future time, but that he *did* fear him *then*. And could not "the searcher of hearts" read Abraham's heart? Could he not tell, whether it was an obedient heart, without vining some outward action to judge by?

"And they shall afflict them four hundred years." Gen. xv. 13. Were not the Egyptians free agents in persecuting the Israelites? Or was the prophecy conditional? on what? Again, was Joseph's interpretation of the butler's and baker's dreams in Gen. xl. *accidentally* right? Or was Pharaoh not a free agent in restoring the one, and hanging the other? Again in 1 Kings, xiii. 1—6, God sends a prophet to foretell, that a person *not yet born, whom he names*, would at some future time, burn men's bones upon a certain altar, and as a sign that the prophet was speaking by his authority, the altar is miraculously rent in two, and the ashes poured out. Now without referring to the fulfilment of that prophecy in 2 Kings, xxiii, 15—18, we need only observe, that if God did *not* foreknow the acts of Josiah, he worked a miracle to make people think he did: if he *did* foreknow them—was Josiah not a free agent? In 2 Kings, viii. 12, Elisha says he *knows* the evil, that Hazael *will* do, when he becomes King of Syria. How could Elisha know it, unless God had told him? Was this then a *conditional* prophecy? Hazael *would* do it, *if* he did it! Ps. lxxii 11. "Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him." Will all these kings and nations then not be free agents? or is it conditional? They *shall* do so, if they *will* do so! Ps. cx. 3. "Thy people *shall be willing* in the day of thy power." Here *the very condition itself, their willingness*, is the thing foretold. It must be self-evident to any one, that if God did not know, *who* would be willing, he could not possibly know, that *any* would. Is. xi. 9. "They shall not hurt, nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea." Now let me just ask Mr Barker, whether he can rest in unhesitating confidence on this promise, believing that such a period of blessedness *will certainly* arrive, *because* God has said it? He cannot do so, without admitting the foreknowledge of God; unless he contends, that the inhabitants of the earth at that time will not be free agents, responsible for their actions. In Is. xli. 23, xlv. 7, 8, xlv. 21, xlv. 9—11, xlviii. 1—8. Jehovah challenges the idols of the heathen to show themselves Gods *by foretelling things to come*; which he asserts his own power of doing, and on which he rests his claim to supreme Deity! Now only see what a dilemma this reduces Mr. Barker to! He acknowledges, that God foreknows "every thing that is *certain*"; but the moral actions of free agents, he contends, cannot be certain, and therefore God cannot foreknow them. This is as much as to say, that God foreknows earthquakes, volcanoes, wind, hail, rain, &c. but not one of the future movements of the human race, either individually or collectively—or any thing in short, over which man can exercise the slightest influence. And

then, in this utter ignorance of any thing that mankind will ever do or accomplish on this globe, Jehovah claims Divine honour as the only true God, *on the ground of his absolute foreknowledge!!* Indeed what are all the prophecies from Isaiah to Malachi, but one continued claim to foreknowledge? Just look, for instance, at the book of Daniel, especially the 11th chapter; and you will find foretold, not one event or twenty, but a long complicated chain of events, including wars, marriages, &c. &c. all depending on the moral actions of free agents, and every one of which was literally and minutely fulfilled.

Having thus taken the Old Testament evidence on the subject, we now turn to the New, to see whether Jesus claimed foreknowledge of the moral actions of responsible beings. "From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed." Matt. xvi. 21. "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of Man shall be betrayed unto the chief priests and unto the scribes, and they shall condemn him to death, and shall deliver him to the Gentiles to mock and to scourge, and to crucify him" Matt. xx. 18, 19. "And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me," &c, Matt. xxvi. 21—25. "Verily I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice." Matt. xxvi. 34. "For Jesus *knew from the beginning*, who they were that believed not, and *who should betray him*" John vi. 64. "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service." John xvi. 2. "For these things were done, that the Scriptures should be fulfilled, which said, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him, whom they have pierced." John xix. 36, 37. "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, when thou wast young, thou girdest thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest: but when thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not. This spake he, signifying by what death he should glorify God" John xxi. 18, 19. Were the crucifiers of Peter then not free agents? "Him, being delivered by the *determinate counsel* and *foreknowledge of God*, ye have taken, and by *wicked hands* have crucified and slain." Acts ii 23. Here we have determination or predestination, foreknowledge and free agency all meeting in one event. God *determined* that Jesus *should* be crucified; he *foreknew who would* crucify him; and yet the crucifiers must have been free agents, or else they could not have been *wicked* for doing it. "For whom he did *foreknow*, he also did predestinate to be



conformed to the image of his Son " Rom viii. 29. See also Eph. i. 4—11. "God hath not cast away his people, which he *foreknew*." Rom. xi. 2. "Elect according to the *foreknowledge* of God the Father." 1 Pet. 1, 2.

It may seem almost a waste of time, after this, to say anything on the particular application of Mr Barker's theory to the person of Jesus Christ; namely, that God did not know, until he had tried him, whether he would answer the purpose of a Messiah, and consequently, that Jesus was never prophesied of as an individual; especially as this is involved in both the two following subjects, the Miraculous Conception, and the Deity of Christ. A few reflections however may be useful; in which we will endeavour not to trench on either of these points.

Now to bring forward all the particular prophecies concerning the Messiah, which met in so remarkable a manner in the person of Jesus Christ, would be quite unnecessary; we require nothing more than the general fact that *a* Messiah was promised by God to the world (which Mr. Barker admits); and it follows *necessarily*, that *the* Messiah must have been foreknown by God; for if God did not know *who* would be the Messiah, he could not possibly know, that there would be a Messiah at all. He might think it *extremely probable*, that among the millions of Adam's race, one would be found fit and willing to be the Saviour of the World;\* but if God does not foreknow the actions of free agents, he could not possibly *know* or be *absolutely sure*, that such a one would ever arise; unless indeed he had determined that, if no free agent would undertake the office, he would *compel* some one to undertake it against his will. Mr Barker contends, that God could not know whether Jesus would stand the test, until he had tried him; and suggests, that others may have been tried, and failed, before. Of course therefore it was quite possible, that Jesus himself might have failed; and then another would have to be tried; and if he failed, another—and so on: in short *every one* might have failed, and there have been no Christ at all! Imagine the consternation of patriarchs and prophets in heaven, as centuries rolled on and no Saviour had appeared in the world; the multitude of promises and prophecies which they had always rested on as the sure word of God, still unfulfilled! And when they ask their heavenly Father about this seeming difficulty, he explains it by telling them, that all his prophecies, which depend on the future actions of free agents, must necessarily be *conditional*; that when he promised a Saviour to the world, the condition was of course implied—if he could find

\* Of course I waive all questions here about the Atonement, &c. and argue on the ground, that any man good enough might answer the purpose of a Messiah.

one: that the promises were indeed expressed very positively, because, all men being born upright and innocent, it was extremely improbable that not one would reach the standard required; but so it was; every trial had proved a failure, and he was *disappointed* in them all!!!—Need I “go any farther in my suppositions”? Or will this be set aside as an appeal to human reason? Well then, listen to “the teaching of Christ” himself, as you find it in John xviii 37. “Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. *To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world*, that I should bear witness unto the truth.” Surely this must be enough for any ordinary mind. St. Paul at least seems to have had no doubt on the subject; for he writes to Timothy, “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptance, that Christ Jesus *came into the world to save sinners.*” I Tim. i. 15. And again to the Galatians, ch. iv 4, “*When the fulness of the time was come*, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.” There was therefore a definite time fixed for the Messiah’s appearance. And when we add to this, that he was to be born according to the prophecies at Bethlehem and of the family of David, and that our Saviour fulfilled all these requirements, we shall scarcely be able to agree with Mr. Barker, that Jesus was never prophesied of individually; but shall be perhaps more inclined to yield assent to the angel’s saying, that “the testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy.”

But we need not multiply passages or proofs. The denial of God’s Foreknowledge, especially when applied to the Christhood of Jesus, must appear at a glance so perfectly irrational to every reflecting mind, and so palpably unscriptural to every enlightened mind, that I should scarcely have thought it worth devoting a page to, but for the sake of showing the depths into which we may sink, if we are once shaken from the rock of eternal truth, and are tempted to set our feet upon the quicksands of error. Dear Friends, these quicksands are much easier got on, than got off. Don’t try any dangerous experiments; *take heed* that you be not uttering the prayer of hypocrisy, when you say, Lead us not into temptation.

---

#### ERRATUM.

At page 86, line 6, for “Is this enough” read “Is not this enough.”

## LECTURE X.

### THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION.

God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh. Rom. viii. 3.

ON reaching this subject the ground changes. For the words of scripture are so positive, that not only can there be no dispute about their meaning, but, what is a very different thing, there actually is none. I am not aware that any human being ever denied the fact of our Lord's conception by the Holy Ghost of the virgin Mary being taught in the two first chapters of St. Matthew and St. Luke. The only question is, Are these chapters genuine? If they are, the point is decided. But this some Unitarians doubt, and others deny. Let us examine on what grounds. The question is a simple matter of evidence, and must be tried as you would any other historical fact. Amongst the learned, who have opportunities of examining the evidence for themselves, the controversy has been settled long ago; indeed, no one in the present day, whether Unitarian or not, who has enough learning to make him care about risking the reputation of it, would venture to dispute their genuineness.\* But as I am not writing for such, I know not how I can give the unlearned a better idea of the merits of the question, than by supposing the following case. In the course of conversation with a stranger, I happen to mention the great victory gained by the English at the battle of Waterloo. S. Indeed you are very much mistaken: the English were completely routed in that battle. What could make you think the contrary? I. Why every newspaper in Europe said so. S. Very true; but they were all *paid* to say so. You don't think I am going to be duped by a set of

\* The Unitarian Lardner, one of the most learned critics that ever lived decides positively in their favour; and pronounces the evidence to be *indisputable*. So does Socinus himself.

*hireling* editors. *I.* But all the soldiers, who had been at the battle themselves, said the same; and say so still. *S.* No doubt they do—because they would lose their *pensions*, if they dared to tell the truth. *I.* But every history of the war, that has come from the press, states that Napoleon was beaten on that occasion. *S.* Perhaps so—because it flatters the vanity of the English, and makes their books *sell*. *I.* But the French writers confess it themselves. *S.* Because they are *bribed* to do so. *I.* But the government published official notices of it. *S.* Yes; and no doubt it answered some purpose of their own, to make the nation believe it. Probably it was to make them more willing to pay the immense additional *taxes*. *I.* But how incredible that such a thing could be palmed upon the public without detection; and that it should always have been so universally believed! *S.* Why, you see, in those days, “complete emancipation” had not come in: people let their minds be held in bondage by “interested parties,” instead of thinking for themselves. They are beginning now to throw off their fetters, and see through the deception that has been practised on them. But you will find it was not so universally believed as you seem to think, when I state my authority for disbelieving it—which is this. A certain person told me, that he had in his possession an account of the battle, written by a soldier who was present; in which it was clearly shewn that Napoleon gained a splendid victory. *I.* But are you aware that your informant was branded as a deserter; that he was a notorious inventor of the most absurd and monstrous falsehoods conceivable; and that this very account, which he pretended to have received from an eye-witness, he was proved to have patched up himself from several others, leaving out, putting in, and altering just as he pleased? *S.* I know all this was said by his enemies; indeed I cannot altogether defend him myself, or believe all his statements. But, whatever he may be in other things, I am quite satisfied he is a credible witness in this particular point, and that his evidence is amply sufficient to overthrow all you have brought on the other side. Besides, it is so very *unlikely* that Napoleon should be beaten after conquering nearly all Europe; the reasons that are given to *account* for it are so very unsatisfactory; and the difference to be found in the various histories of it are so many, that the internal evidence alone is conclusive against the commonly received opinion. There are so many things too, that I cannot *make out* about the occurrence. I have examined all the accounts of it, and seen a plan of the locality; but still I cannot ascertain precisely where each particular regiment was placed, and how long it stayed there, and where it went to, and why it did this, and why it did not do that. Nor can any one give me satisfactory information as to the name of the first

soldier that fell, and whether he was shot through the head or through the heart. In fact the whole thing is involved in such mystery, that it is quite clear all the narratives of it are mere fictions.

Now every one, who has fairly investigated the subject before us, knows perfectly well, that such an argument as this would have just as much ground to rest on, as the argument against the authenticity of the two first chapters in Matthew and Luke. The evidence in their favour may be briefly stated under three heads. 1. *There is not a single copy of the New Testament in the world, whether in manuscript or print, of whatever age, or in whatever language, that does not contain them.* How utterly incredible (supposing the original gospels not to have contained them, which is Mr. Barker's theory) that not one single unadulterated copy should be in existence! That amidst all the multitude of various readings, which abound in the different manuscripts and versions, not one should be found in any corner of the world, which disagrees with their unanimous verdict about these chapters, or gives the least hint of their being spurious!\* 2. All the Fathers of the Christian Church, from Ignatius the companion of Peter and Paul downwards, assent to that article of the Apostle's Creed, "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary;" and nearly, if not quite, all of them refer to the disputed chapters, as the genuine writings of Matthew and Luke, and of inspired authority. We are not, observe, bringing forward the *opinion* of the Fathers to decide a matter of *doctrine*, but their *evidence*, as witnesses to decide a matter of *fact*; namely, that the disputed chapters have always formed part of the New Testament. Their evidence on this point is as conclusive as anything can possibly be: so that, if the chapters are spurious, they must have been forged, and received as part of the genuine gospels, *in the very life-time of the Apostles*. And how this could be accomplished, I leave for others to explain. 3. In all the controversies that took place between the early Christians and their heathen opponents, no doubt was ever raised *on either side* about the authenticity of these parts of the New Testament, nor any charge of forgery ever made against the Christians. "They stated many objections to particular circumstances in the narrative of the miraculous conception, but never entertained the most remote idea of treating the whole as spurious. They did not contend as our modern objectors do, that Matthew and Luke never wrote these accounts, but that, in writing them, they committed errors, or related falsehoods. To these decisive testimonies

\* The Unitarian translation, published within the last half century, is of course excepted.

of the adversaries of Christians we add a fact by no means unimportant, as an accessory proof; which is, that no objections were ever brought against these chapters in the early centuries, during the heat of religious contention, when all parties sought to defend themselves, and to assail their opponents, by arguments of all kinds, industriously drawn from every quarter."\* Really if a thing, resting on such an overwhelming mass of evidence, should after all be found untrue, there can be no certainty about any event that has ever happened in the world. Indeed we can scarcely conceive any possible amount of objections, that could overbalance such proof. Mr. Barker surely must have something very startling indeed to produce, as his authority, for rejecting this part of God's word. And startling enough it is to a person accustomed to any ordinary method of reasoning. He tells us, that a sect called the Ebionites had a copy of St. Matthew's gospel, which did not contain the two first chapters; and that a sect called the Marcionites had a copy of Luke's gospel, which did not contain the first two chapters. This is the entire *external* evidence brought against them! Several hundred persons swear to having seen a man commit a certain act; two persons swear an alibi—and the jury in consequence say, Not guilty!! What would be said in such a case? That the jury went by the evidence? No; but that they went in the very teeth of it. And what would be said, if the two witnesses adduced were notorious and convicted liars? Why that their denial made the fact rather more likely to be true than otherwise. This is the precise state of the case with regard to the Ebionites and Marcionites. Let us begin with the former.

### THE EBIONITES.

It is assumed, that these were the early Jewish Christians, or Nazarenes, for whose use especially St. Matthew's gospel was written; and therefore that their copy was more likely to be the correct one than any other. But the learned Unitarian Lardner, Bishop Horsley, and others, have shown beyond all doubt, that the Hebrew Christians, Nazarenes, and Ebionites, were quite distinct sects.

"The Hebrew Christians, to whom St. Matthew wrote, were the body of Jewish converts in his time, who laid aside the use of the Mosaic law.

"Of the Nazarenes there were two descriptions: 1. The Nazarenes of the better sort, who were orthodox in their creed, though they continued to observe the Mosaic law: but

\* Hartwell Horne,

being great admirers of St. Paul, they could not esteem the law generally necessary to salvation. 2. The Nazarenes of a worse sort were bigotted to the Jewish law, but still orthodox in their creed, for any thing that appears to the contrary: These were the proper Nazarenes mentioned by Epiphanius and Jerome. Both of these classes of Nazarenes believed Jesus Christ to be born of a virgin by the special interposition of God, and consequently received the two first chapters of St. Matthew's gospel.

"The Ebionites also were divided into two classes: 1. Those who denied our Lord's Divinity, *but admitted the fact of the Miraculous Conception*: consequently the two first chapters of Matthew were admitted by them; and 2. Ebionites of a worse sort, who, though they denied the Miraculous Conception, still maintained the Union of Jesus with a Divine Being, which commenced upon his baptism. These Ebionites, Epiphanius relates, made use of a Hebrew gospel of Matthew, *which was not only defective, but also contained many fabulous stories*. The Ebionites, he adds, branched off from the Nazarenes, *and did not appear till after the destruction of Jerusalem*.

"Now since the Ebionites "of a worse sort," as Bishop Horsley terms them, did not make their appearance until the commencement of the *second* century, and as they used a *mutilated* and *corrupted* copy of St. Matthew's gospel, the absence of the two first chapters of Matthew from their gospel, is so far from making any thing *against* the authenticity of those chapters, that on the contrary it affords a strong evidence *for it*: since we are enabled satisfactorily to account for the omission of those chapters in their copy, and to prove from the united antecedent, concurrent, and subsequent testimonies of various writers, *both Christians and adversaries of Christianity*, that they *did* exist in all the other copies of St. Matthew's gospel, and were explicitly referred to or recited by them."\*

All that need be added to this is, that the Ebionite gospel was a mutilated one, *by our opponent's own showing*: for they acknowledge that the *genealogy* was a genuine part of the original gospel, although the Ebionites cut it out of their copy with the rest of the two chapters. And yet these same Ebionites, who both added to, and took from, St. Matthew's gospel, who made the ceremonial law necessary to salvation, who denied that the prophets of the Old Testament spoke by inspiration of God, who considered St. Paul an apostate and impostor—these are the *ONLY* witnesses brought forward to disprove the genuineness of St. Matthew's account of the Miraculous Conception!!

## THE MARCIONITES.

But the case attempted to be made out against St. Luke's account is, if possible, weaker still. We are told that Marcion possessed a copy of his gospel, which did not contain the two first chapters. Here then are two things to be considered: 1. The character of Marcion in general; and, 2. The particular facts relative to his gospel.

I. Every one with the smallest knowledge of Church History knows that, if there ever was a heretic, Marcion was undoubtedly and pre-eminently one. Mr. Barker tries to shuffle out of this, by saying that the orthodox writers often told lies of their opponents; and he quotes John Wesley's opinion, that many of the men, who were called heretics, were the best men of the day. Now we are no more inclined, than he is, to condemn a man for a heretic, merely because he was called one: nor should we think *Lardner* was a person at all likely to be led away by a name, or admit the statements of the Fathers without the strongest reason; yet his opinion of Marcion (with which every one agrees, who has investigated the subject as learnedly and deeply as he did) is very well known. I cannot give it better than by the following extract from a tract on the Incarnation, by the Rev. W. Cooke.—“Dr. Lardner has given a copious account of Marcion in his *Credibility of the Gospel History*; and, as he is a Socinian writer, I shall extract from him an account of this propagator of heresy. Marcion taught, that besides the good and benevolent Deity, there was another who was evil. That the evil Deity was the creator of the world, against the will of the benevolent Deity: he taught that this malignant Deity was the God of the Jews—the Jehovah of the Old Testament, and the author of the Jewish law of sacrifice. He said that this Deity was cruel, severe, jealous, and the enemy of the good Deity, and of mankind. He maintained that Jesus had no real body, and, therefore, denied that he was either miraculously conceived or born at all in any way; that his body was a mere phantom. According to Tertullian, who lived in the same century, he held that human actions were not free, but controlled by necessity. He denied the resurrection of the body. According to Tertullian, Origen, and Athanasius: he believed there were to be two Christs, the one sent by the good Deity to deliver men from the Creator of the world and from the malignant influence of matter, and another to be sent by the evil principle. He condemned marriage—pronounced it sinful, impure, and odious in the eyes of the true God, whom he called a hater of marriage. The Marcionites fasted on the Sabbath or seventh day, out of their hatred to the God of the Jews, who was the Creator of this world.



"To support these Gnostic fancies, Marcion rejected the whole of the Old Testament as proceeding from the Creator, the author of all the sin and misery in the world. He argued that the law and gospel could not come from the same being, as they are inconsistent one with the other. The New Testament he mutilated to render it subservient to his view. He rejected the history of Christ's incarnation, because, from his opposition to matter, he would have it that Christ had no real body. He rejected altogether the gospels of Matthew, and Mark, and John, the Acts of the Apostles, and twelve of the other books. Even those which he received he abridged, interpolated, or altered to suit his purpose, rejecting all passages which admitted the authority of the Old Testament, or which related to the law and the prophets, or which were quoted from thence, as plainly foretelling the coming of Jesus Christ, or which spoke of his Father as the Creator of the world. Such is the account which Lardner himself furnishes of Marcion; and all his statements are supported by their respective authorities at the foot of the page." Will Mr. Barker tell us whether he allows such opinions as these to be heresy; and whether the man who held them was likely to be one of the best men of the day?

To understand however the full merits of the case we must proceed to examine,

II. The particular facts relative to Marcion's gospel. These are very clearly stated by Dr. J. P. Smith, in his scripture testimony to the Messiah. "The gospel used by Marcion certainly did not contain the first two of Luke; *but neither did it contain the third chapter, nor more than one half of the fourth*: and in the subsequent parts, (as we are informed by Dr. Lardner, who had examined this subject with his usual minuteness and accuracy) *it was mutilated and altered in a great variety of places. He would not allow it to be called the gospel of St. Luke*, erasing the name of that evangelist from the beginning of his copy. His alterations were not made on any critical principles, but in the most arbitrary manner, in order to suit his extravagant theology. Indeed the opinion that he used Luke's gospel at all rests upon no sufficient foundation. So different were the two works, that the most distinguished biblical scholars of modern times have rejected that opinion altogether. Griesbach maintained, that Marcion *compiled a work of his own*, for the service of his system and the use of his followers, from the writings of the Evangelists, and particularly of St. Luke." "That Marcion used St. Luke's gospel at all," says Bishop Marsh, "is a position which has been taken for granted without the least proof. *Marcion himself never pretended that it was the gospel of St. Luke*, as Tertullian acknowledges. It is probable therefore that he

used some apochryphal gospel that had much matter in common with that of St. Luke, but yet was not the same." In addition to this we need only remind you as before, that Marcion's copy was mutilated *on our opponents' own showing*: for they acknowledge the genuineness of the third chapter, which was cut out of his gospel as well as the two first. And yet this man, who believed in two Gods, a good and a bad one; who denied that Christ had any real body; who disbelieved in the doctrine of the resurrection; who rejected all the Old Testament as coming from the bad God; and all the New Testament, except a few of the epistles, which he mutilated and corrupted just to suit his own fancy—this man is the **ONLY** evidence brought forward to overthrow the *unanimous* testimony of all the writers of antiquity, and of all the manuscripts and versions now extant in the world. And when we come to examine even *his* evidence, we find that he has *none whatever to give*; that he said nothing at all about St. Luke's gospel, but rejected all the four gospels together, and patched up one for himself from any or no source. But because this gospel of Marcion's happened to bear some resemblance to St. Luke's, without containing any account of the miraculous conception, the two first chapters are coolly thrown aside as a forgery, in face of the most overwhelming proof of their genuineness. If it was possible for anything to show more clearly than this Mr. Barker's utter contempt of facts in conducting an argument, it would be the motive which he imputes to the orthodox party for forging them; namely, to throw discredit on marriage. For it so happens, that *Marcion* was the man who reviled marriage, which he said the good God hated; while the orthodox Fathers opposed him, and refuted his arguments against it.

So much for the external evidence. Let us now see whether any better case can be made out, from the objections which the chapters themselves are thought to supply.

### INTERNAL EVIDENCE ALLEGED AGAINST THEM.

I. In the first place it is argued, that the genealogies of Matthew and Luke prove Jesus to be the Son of Joseph, and are therefore inconsistent with the story of his miraculous conception. To which we reply, that *both* the genealogies prove exactly the reverse; namely, that Jesus was *not* the son of Joseph. In St. Matthew's, after some forty generations have been given in exactly the same words—"Abraham *begat* Isaac: and Isaac *begat* Jacob: and Jacob *begat* Judas," &c.—upon reaching Joseph, the expression suddenly changes; and, instead of saying "and Joseph *begat* Jesus," it says, "and Jacob *begat* Joseph the husband of Mary, of *whom* was born Jesus."

The word "whom," being in the original of the *singular* number and the *feminine* gender, cannot possibly refer to any one but Mary; so that Joseph is by this genealogy *excluded* from being the father of Jesus, as plainly as words can speak. And scarcely less plainly does St. Luke's genealogy also exclude him, in the words "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age, being (*as was supposed*) the son of Joseph." It is contended that the expression "as was supposed" ought to be translated "as he was enrolled in the public register." It would be a waste of time to argue this, pro or con, as the question is so very little affected by it: for why should the Evangelist put this in, but to guard himself against being thought to mean, that Jesus was *really* Joseph's son? If it be asked, why the genealogy should be given through Joseph instead of through Mary, if Jesus was not his son—we reply, The genealogy is given through Joseph by St. Matthew, because he wrote chiefly for the Jews; who only reckoned their pedigrees in the *male* line, and according to whose law Joseph became the *legal* father of Jesus by marrying his mother. St. Luke on the other hand, who wrote for Gentiles, gives the genealogy of Jesus through Mary, his real mother: for having mentioned that Jesus was supposed to be the son of Joseph, he immediately turns to his mother's line, by saying that Joseph was the son (that is, son-in-law) of Heli. This first objection then turns out to be an exceedingly strong confirmation of the *truth* of the narrative.

II. Next we are reminded, that Jesus calls himself eighty six times "the son of *man*;" and he could be the son of no other man, but Joseph. Now there are two Greek words, both of which are translated "man," but which are quite distinct in the original,—*aner*, which means strictly "a man;" and *anthropos*, which means "a human being" whether man or woman.\* If Jesus, by calling himself "the son of man," intended to teach that he was the son of Joseph, how very remarkable that he should *never once*, out of all those eighty six times, have used the word *aner*, (which would have settled the matter entirely) but should invariably use the doubtful word *anthropos*. By calling himself "the son of *aner*," he would distinctly have taught that Joseph was his father; by calling himself "the son of *anthropos*," he only teaches that he was

\* When Mr. Cooke mentioned this in his discussion with Mr. Barker, he happened to say that *anthropos* meant *both* a man and a woman. Then, replied Mr. Barker, as Jesus calls himself "the son of *anthropos*," he must be the son of *both* a man and a woman; that is, of Joseph and Mary. So because a beast means both a horse and a cow, therefore, if I say that I have purchased a beast, it means that I have purchased *both* a horse and a cow! Mr. Cooke of course meant, that *anthropos* was sometimes used for a man and sometimes for a woman; and no one could understand him to mean anything else. Further comment is unnecessary.

a human being, a partaker of human nature. In the same sense as the Greek word *anthropos*, we use the English word *man*; as when we say, "the fallen nature of *man*," "reason raises *man* above the brute, &c., &c." including both men and women without distinction. This second objection then, like the first, only adds to the previous weight of evidence in *their* favour.

III. Mr. Barker comments on the indelicacy of Joseph and Mary going to Bethlehem together *unmarried*; although the narrative states, that long before their journey to Bethlehem Joseph "did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, *and took unto him his wife.*" Matt. i. 24.

IV. "*In those days* came John the Baptist preaching." Matt. iii. 1. According to this, it is argued, John must have begun to preach immediately after the events just mentioned had occurred; that is, while Jesus was a little child, which was evidently not the case.—On looking at the last verse of the 2nd chapter, we read that "he came and *dwelt* in a city called Nazareth." His *dwelling* at Nazareth therefore fills up the time from his going there to John's preaching. The narrative does not tell us how long he dwelt there; but only that "*in those days*" while he was dwelling there, "*came John the Baptist.*" If Mr. Barker's objection however is harmless against our theory, it is absolutely destructive of his own: for he cuts out from v. 17 of Ch. i. to v. 23 of Ch. ii; so that the narrative would stand thus; "And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ. In those days came John the Baptist preaching in the wilderness." This would make John the Baptist preach in the days when Jesus was born; for there is nothing *here* to fill up the gap, as there is in the other case.

V. Certain prophecies are said to be applied to Christ in these chapters, which in reality have no reference to him at all. For instance, a prophecy from Hos. xi. 1, which refers to the Israelites coming out of Egypt under Moses, is applied to Christ returned from Egypt with Joseph and Mary. This shews, according to Mr. Barker, that the chapters were forged by some "ignorant half-instructed Gentile convert," who knew little or nothing of the Old Testament, and consequently fell into this gross blunder.—May we ask whether the whole body of Christians who *received* the forgery, admitted it into the Canon of Scripture, and acknowledged it to be genuine, were "ignorant half-instructed Gentile converts!" Even if they had all agreed (notwithstanding the bitter quarrels and disputes amongst them) to corrupt the gospels in such an extraordinary manner, and could have succeeded so cleverly, *that not a pure copy should remain in the world*, nor a hint be left of the fraud by any writer of the day, friend or foe—is it not

very strange that not one of them should discover the apparent inconsistency, and have it rectified? Or did they not calculate upon there being such clever people in the nineteenth century as to find it out? Why the fact, that Mr. Barker mentions, stares you broadly in the face the moment you turn to the prophecy. The most ignorant and least instructed convert in the world could see at a glance, that it referred to the Israelites; and the very fact of its being applied to Christ is a strong proof that the writer was inspired: for no one, unless under the immediate inspiration of God, would ever have dreamt of its further reference to Christ, or indeed of its having any other than its natural obvious meaning. Mr. Barker however calls this doctrine of prophecies having a double meaning, the second of which was not understood till afterwards, "a fiction of theologians:" and so it is, but—of *inspired* theologians. The application of this prophecy of Hosea's to Christ is "a fiction" of St. Matthew's. It of course relates primarily to the Israelites; Mr. Barker says it relates to nothing else; *St. Matthew says it does*, and that it was fulfilled in Jesus coming out of Egypt. Which is right? If the prophecy about the Virgin be thought to have had any limited partial application to events of that day, then Matt. i. 23, will be another inspired fiction of a similar kind. Matt. ii. 18, is undoubtedly one. Indeed, any one of the commonest scriptural knowledge, knows that the New Testament abounds with such fictions. David says in Ps. lxxviii. 2, "I will open my mouth in a parable;" and St. Matthew (probably while he was an ignorant half-instructed convert) says that was fulfilled by *Christ* speaking parables. Matt. xiii. 35. Again, David says in Ps. xli. 9, "Yea *mine* own familiar friends, in whom I trusted, which did eat of *my* bread, hath lifted up his heel against *me*;" in Ps. lxix. 4. "They that hate *me* without a cause;" and both of these are applied to Christ *by himself*. Instances might be multiplied without end; but these are quite enough to shew the gross ignorance, or else something worse, of arguing against these chapters, because they point out the concealed reference to Christ in some prophecies, which otherwise we might not have so understood.

VI. Matt. i. 20—23. "We are here told," says Mr. Barker, "that he was called *Jesus* to fulfil a prophecy which said he should be called *Emmanuel*." We are told nothing of the kind. What we are told is, that he was born of Mary without the instrumentality of a human father, to fulfil the prophecy which said that he should be born of a virgin. But if it had been as Mr. Barker would make out, the thing would have been perfectly consistent. The prophecy said he should be called Emmanuel, which means "God with us." Now calling him Jesus, which means in the Hebrew "Saviour," was just the same (in the pre-

eminent sense in which it was applied to him) as calling him "God with us;" for Jehovah had long ago declared, "I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour." It does not always follow, when a person is said to be *called* anything, that that should be his ordinary *name*. For instance, the angel foretold the Virgin Mary, "All generations shall *call* thee blessed:" yet no Protestant supposes himself required, when speaking of her, always to say "the blessed Virgin." If any one should lay stress on the words, "they shall call his *name* Emmanuel," we reply that Jesus *has been* called Emmanuel, amongst other names, at all periods of the Christian dispensation: though the prophecy might have been fulfilled without it, inasmuch as any part of God's character or attributes is constantly in scripture called his "name," so that his name being "called Emmanuel" would have been quite fulfilled in his being *recognised* and *acknowledged* as "God with us."

VII. Matt. ii. 23. "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene." This prophecy, we are triumphantly reminded, cannot be found in the Old Testament—How very remarkable that the forger of these chapters never thought of looking to see whether there was such a prophecy or not, before he committed it to paper. And how still more remarkable that he could not see the contradiction (if such it be) between the fact of the Christ being called Jesus, and two prophecies which said that he should be called Emmanuel and Nazarene! It is commonly thought, that it takes a very clever person to make a forger; but this one must have been the most stupid, blundering, blockhead that ever lived. For his endless mistakes and inconsistencies (if they really *are* such) are not in little minute points such as a forger might overlook, and which could only be discovered by close attention and deep research; but they are the most palpable and obvious things possible, such as the most ignorant may see at a glance. Yet not only did the whole Church suffer these chapters to be palmed upon them at the time; but no one for centuries and centuries had the wit to discover the fraud. It must be allowed however, that the writer of them, whoever he be, has taken the precaution to guard himself against detection in this instance; for he does not say that any particular *prophet* used the words, "He shall be called a Nazarene;" but that it was a thing generally spoken of by *the prophets*. Now to be called a Nazarene, among the Jews, was a bye-word of reproach; the nick-name of "Nazarene" being applied to any thing or person, that was despised, scorned, and looked down upon: as Nathaniel asked, "Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?" If then we turn to the prophets generally, we find them speaking of the Messiah, as one who would be "des-

pised and rejected of men;" which is just what the Jews meant by calling any one a Nazarene. So that the fact of Jesus being a dweller at this disreputable city of Nazareth served to increase the hatred and contempt which the Jews felt towards him, and thus to fulfill those prophecies which had foretold the treatment he would receive. This apparent difficulty therefore, like all the rest, turns out on examination to be nothing at all.

VIII. Matt. i. 19. "Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily." The objection raised here is, that Joseph's being a *just*\* man is given as the reason for not making her a public example; although *justice* would have required her to be stoned according to the law of Moses. This, says Mr. Barker, proves that the writer was ignorant of the Jewish law.—If so, it must also prove that the whole church, who were duped into receiving it as the writing of St. Matthew, were ignorant of it as well. But it is quite clear that St. Matthew does not mention the fact of Joseph being a just man, as the reason for his sparing her; but as the reason for his determining not to marry her. Joseph, being a just man, was unwilling to marry one whom he could not but look upon as an adulteress; and yet his love for her would not allow him to make a public example of her: for these two reasons, therefore, he "was minded to put her away privily."

IX. Matt. ii. 3. "When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." Why should "all Jerusalem," it is asked, be troubled at hearing of the birth of their promised King?—Why because they well knew, from his jealous and bloody character, that Herod was as likely as not to commit some wholesale massacre, in his rage at a rival to the throne being born; and his slaughter of the children at Bethlehem shewed they had good reason to be troubled. Whatever "the half-instructed gentile convert," who forged these chapters, was "ignorant" of, he certainly shewed that he had a very intimate acquaintance with the character of Herod, both by representing all Jerusalem as being troubled with him at the report of the Messiah's birth, and by inventing the story of the slaughter at Bethlehem.

X. But contemporary writers make no mention of this slaughter, or any of these remarkable events.—"I would ask," replied Dr. Nares, "what contemporary writers were then to notice them? Josephus was not born till many years afterwards, and he had great reason for suppressing such relations.

\* When it suits his purpose, Mr. Barker contends that the Greek word, translated "just," may mean "merciful"; if so, with what honesty can he make the above objection?

Could any author be named, that was so situated and circumstanced as to be likely to record such transactions, the Evangelists excepted?" Besides, amongst Herod's numberless other atrocities, the murder of the infants under two years old (which could not be very many) in the little village of Bethlehem would scarcely be worth an historian's notice.

XI. In this objection, and the next, I shall content myself with quoting from Dr. Nare's remarks on the Unitarian Version of the New Testament. "The note next proceeds to say, that if it be true, as Luke relates, Chap. iii. 23, that Jesus was entering upon his thirtieth year in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, he must have been born two years at least after the death of Herod, 'a circumstance which alone invalidates the whole story.' See Lardner's works v. i. p. 432. Here again they come most decisively to the point. We should at least suppose that this has the sanction of the great authority they cite; and yet Lardner (to whom they so very confidently refer) actually enters upon this difficulty, with the following remark: 'It may be made appear *several ways*, that Jesus was born above a year, probably above two years, before Herod died.' So that I here shall beg leave to join in the reference, and entreat the reader to turn to Lardner, and see how ably he combats the difficulty, and in *how many ways* he unravels the mystery."\*

XII. "The date of the enrolment, Luke ii. 1, is mentioned as a great historical difficulty, without however the usual reference to Lardner, who, though he certainly treats it as a difficulty, so unravels the mystery as to leave it so no longer." The learned may consult him on the point.

XIII. But why did Jesus himself say nothing about it in his preaching? Especially why did he not undeceive the people, when they said, Is not this Joseph's son?—We find that on many occasions he had reasons, which are not known to us, for being very reserved; *even forbidding persons to tell any one that he was Christ*. Yet no one brings that forward as an argument to prove that he was not the Christ. In this case however there was a very good reason why he should not plainly and publicly deny that Joseph was his father. For if he had, the unbelieving Jews would never have credited the story of the Miraculous Conception, and would have stoned Mary as an adulteress. If it be objected, that in this case the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception cannot be part of the gospel, inasmuch as Jesus was "anointed to preach the gospel," we reply, that Jesus assured his disciples he had *not*

\* It is very remarkable, that in the Ebionite's gospel, which is Mr. Barker's authority for rejecting St. Matthew's, there is a real and positive contradiction in the dates.



taught them all it was necessary for them to know and teach, John xvii. 12, 13; and therefore, although he preached the gospel (that is, good news) to a certain extent with his own mouth, yet the full unfolding of the plan of salvation he evidently preached by the mouth and pen of his apostles, after his ascension into heaven and the out-pouring of the Holy Ghost.\*

XIV. But further, it is asserted that the apostles themselves did not teach it.—Yes they did. St. Matthew and St. Luke each devoted two whole chapters to it. Find me any one doctrine of revelation, that occupies as large a space in the New Testament as the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception, except it be the Crucifixion. After such a full statement as we have in these chapters, we should scarcely expect much further mention of it. "But the objection," says Dr Nares again, "that no allusion is made to the Miraculous Conception and birth of Jesus in any other passages of scripture, depends entirely upon the construction put upon various passages which might be selected. To a Unitarian, such expressions as "God sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh;" "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us;" "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law;" may seem to carry in them no allusion to anything out of the common course of things; but to those who believe the accounts of the Miraculous Conception of Jesus, nothing can be more direct and conclusive than such references. It is a mere begging of the question then to pretend that no such allusions exist. If the narrative be true, all these expressions are the strongest allusions possible; if it be not true, they are as near as can be totally unintelligible."

XV. But the Apostles, in their Epistles, never condemn the heretics who denied the Miraculous Conception.—Yes they do. The deniers of it in the Apostles' days were the heretics who taught that Jesus had no real body, but only the appearance of one: those in short who "denied that Jesus Christ was come *in the flesh*," and whom St. John denounces so sternly in his first Epistle as "deceivers and Antichrists."

XVI. Another difficulty is raised about the "wise men;" who, it is said, were sorcerers, and therefore not likely per-

\* In writing to the Ephesians, St. Paul says, "But ye have not so learned Christ; if so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus." As the Ephesians had never heard or been taught by Christ personally, he must have taught them either by the writings of the prophets, or by the mouths of the Apostles; both of whom wrote and spoke by "the spirit of Christ." 1 Pet. i. 2. This passage therefore (Eph. iv. 21.) is another proof of the plenary inspiration of the Apostles; inasmuch as to hear them was to hear Christ, and to be taught by them was to be taught by Christ; agreeably to our Lord's words, "He that heareth you heareth me." So that if Christ was infallible, his Apostles must have been infallible too.

sons for God to favour with a special revelation.—It is not at all necessary that they should have been sorcerers; but if they were, does not the Apostle tell us, 1 Cor. i. 23, that “God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty; and *base things of the world*, and things that are despised, hath God chosen; yea and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: *that no flesh should glory in his presence?*” Was not Rahab the harlot chosen to be the honoured instrument of preserving the Israelites? Besides, if these men *had* been sorcerers, might they not have repented of their sin, and left it off? And is not a penitent sorcerer as likely to be peculiarly honoured by God, as a penitent adulterer like David, a penitent blasphemer like Peter, or a penitent persecutor like Saul?

XVII. But how is it, that we never hear of them afterwards?—Because it did not suit the purposes of God, that we should.

XVIII. And how is it, that only one incident in all the early part of the life of Jesus is given us?—Because that was all God saw fit to tell us.

XIX. And why did not Mark and John mention the circumstance as well as Matthew and Luke?—Because the Spirit of God directed them not to do so. If it should be objected, that St. Mark opens with “*The beginning* of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God;” we reply, that he twice refers to the Miraculous Conception in those few words. 1. By calling him “Christ;” inasmuch as it was foretold that the Christ or Messiah should be born of a Virgin. 2. By calling him “the Son of God:” inasmuch as the angel said to Mary, “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing, which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.”

XX. But Jesus was to be “made in all points like unto his brethren.”—If one marble statue is to be made in all points like another, must it therefore be made by the same hands or with the same instruments?

XXI. Is it credible, that his parents would keep him in subjection as a child, if they knew him to be the Messiah?—They would do just as God directed them. But Jesus required no *keeping* in subjection; for his being subject willingly to his earthly parents was part of the perfect righteousness he wrought out for his people, by which he “magnified the law, and made it honourable.”

XXII. But does not Mary herself say to him, “*Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing?*”—Yes; in one of the very chapters, which are said to be forged, and which relate the story of the Miraculous Conception. The writer therefore

could not have thought there was any contradiction between the two; any more than I did, when I spoke just now of "his earthly *parents*." Nor is there the least inconsistency. How often do we speak of a child's "parents" or of "his father and mother," when the child only has a *step-father*. This was the case with Joseph. By marrying the mother of Jesus, he became his *legal* father, and would be always called his father.

XXIII. "That John the Baptist should be ignorant of the person of Christ," say the Editors of the Unitarian Version, "is not probable if this narrative be true." "Though it has been pretty generally supposed," replies Dr. Nares, "that John knew not the person of Jesus before his baptism, we are not quite certain that this was actually the case. In two instances John does certainly declare, that he 'knew him not:' but we much question if more was implied by these terms than that he knew him not as the Messiah, till it was especially revealed to him on his approach to be baptised. Grotius is disposed to adopt this interpretation.\* But those who do not adopt it, very rationally attribute his ignorance to the providential interposition of God, to take off all suspicion of conspiracy. At all events no argument can be drawn from a circumstance, which, *for* anything we know, might be accidental, and *from* what we know, would appear to be providential."

XXIV. But how very strange that not even his brothers should have known it!—Not at all. How could they know it, without their father or mother told them? And the same reason, which prevented Jesus from speaking publicly about it, would also keep his parents silent on the subject.

XXV. But how very strange that the story of the Magi, and of the shepherds, with the prophecy of Simeon and Anna, should all be forgotten, and no general expectation excited by them amongst the Jews!—Just what might have been expected. Every body of course supposed that he was murdered with the infants at Bethlehem, and so they would naturally think no more of him; or if they did, the fear of Herod would keep them quiet. Besides, the time Jesus was concealed in Egypt was quite enough for any excitement that may have been raised to die away: and on his return, he passed a retired life with his parents at Nazareth. God could easily so order things, that no one should even suspect this young carpenter to have been the child, who a few years back caused such a disturbance at Jerusalem and Bethlehem: or in the words of the Unitarian Editors on another occasion, he might "exert his divine power to restrain men from so beholding him as to know him."

\* Priestly does adopt it.

XXVI. But some of the Fathers give very strange reasons for the Miraculous Conception.—“Perhaps they do: what then.” Some historians give very strange reasons for Napoleon’s conduct on certain occasions. Does that alter the facts?

XXVII. A contradiction is thought to exist between the declaration of the angel, “Of his kingdom there shall be no end,” and the Apostle’s saying, that a time will come, “when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father.” Much the same *apparent* inconsistency is observable in what is said of the saints, who reign with Christ; that “they shall reign a thousand years,” and that “they shall reign for ever and ever.” In both cases, the kingdoms spoken of are of different kinds. It would occupy far too much time to enter at all into this subject here: but we may remind you, that one, whom our Lord himself calls “the prophet Daniel,” saw a vision in which “an *everlasting* dominion” was given to the Son of man; which removes any cavil against the angel’s message to Mary, however you may understand the expression about the Son delivering up his (probably *mediatorial*) kingdom.

Such are some of the “at least a hundred” objections, which Mr Barker says can be raised against these chapters: and after what we have already seen, there is little doubt that a hundred might be raised, or indeed as many as ever the objector choose to invent. But as these twenty-seven are all I can find in his writings, we may calculate that the remaining seventy-three are of the same stamp, if indeed it be not more probable that those already mentioned were selected as being the strongest of the set. And what do they all come to when put together? Why just nothing. Some of them being utterly futile, others being easily explained by giving a little “attention to reading,” and others actually furnishing strong internal evidence *in favour* of their genuineness.

We shall now conclude our evidence by producing demonstrative proof from the chapters which are acknowledged to be genuine, that neither Matthew’s nor Luke’s gospel could possibly have been written as Mr. Barker would make out. 1. The first sentence of St. Matthew’s third Chapter contains the word *de*, usually translated “now,” though omitted in our translation of this verse, which should be “*Now* in those days.” This word *de* is never thus used in the Greek, except when something has gone before; nor indeed could the words “in those days” have any sense, if they had commenced the book. So that the Ebionite gospel which began with this verse is evidently mutilated. Mr. Barker would make the first sixteen

verses of Chap. i. go before Chap. iii. 1 : but the impossibility of that has been already shewn ; for the expression "in those days" would then refer to the *birth* of Christ, which is palpably untrue, instead of to his *dwelling* at Nazareth (according to the received version) which is as palpably true. 2. Precisely the same thing is observable in St. Luke's gospel, which Mr. Barker would make to begin at Chap. iii. 1 : for this verse also begins with the Greek word *de*, "*Now* in the fifteenth year." The gospel then *could not possibly* have commenced here, but *must* have had something before. Nor could it have commenced with the second Chapter ; for the first verse of that also has the decisive word *de*, which is in this passage translated "and."

Upon the whole then, considering the overwhelming proof we possess of the truth of this account, as well as the total absence of anything like a valid objection to it of any kind whatever, a candid mind capable of understanding an argument will be disposed to think the parable we commenced with rather under, than over, coloured. We may safely say, that not a chapter in the whole Bible can be proved to be genuine more positively than these four. You may just as rationally cut out any other portion of scripture whatever from Genesis to Revelation, as these accounts of the Miraculous Conception. Nor would it be one atom more absurd to deny that such persons as Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, or Napoleon Buonaparte, ever existed, than it is to deny that St. Matthew and St. Luke were the authors of the two narratives in question.

One important point yet remains to be noticed, namely, *the necessity* that existed for the Saviour being thus born. 'This is pointed out in the words of our text, "God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh." If Jesus had been begotten by man, he would have received man's corrupt nature, for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh"\* But though God sent forth his Son in real flesh, yet it was not in "*sinful* flesh," (for how then could he have offered up a pure sacrifice for the sins of the world?) but only "*in the likeness* of sinful flesh." If there were no other passage in scripture to prove the two doctrines, that the nature which man receives by generation from his father is a fallen nature ; and therefore, that Jesus must have received his human nature *in some other way*—this would be of itself sufficient. For in the first place "flesh" generally is pronounced "sinful ;" and in the second place, the word "likeness" distinctly shews that the flesh, which Jesus had, was not sinful,—which

\* See previous lecture on Man's Fallen Nature.

it must have been, if he had received it in the ordinary way. He would then have had to say with David, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.\*" The Saviour's Immaculate Conception then is not only necessarily referred to, but may be absolutely proved from, those numberless passages of scripture, which speak of him as "holy, harmless, undefiled," "without sin," "without blemish and without spot." And is not this striking testimony, which the Miraculous Conception thus bears to the reality of original sin, a main cause of the attempt that is made to get rid of it? We would not class together the deceiver and the deceived, or accuse all who disbelieve the Miraculous Conception of wilful dishonesty: but knowing what a blinding effect deep-rooted error has upon the mind, we have no hesitation in expressing our conviction, that a dispute on the subject would never have been heard of in the Christian Church, if the scriptural account had not stood in the way of some theory, which the advocates of it were determined not to yield.

\* A very little reflection will soon convince any one, that the objection about original sin being usually attached to the fact of being "*born of a woman*" is a mere cavil: inasmuch as in no case, except that of Jesus, was any one born of a woman without a human father; and in his case, the Apostle has pointed out the peculiarity of his birth by the expression "*made of a woman*," which in the original is very marked.

## LECTURE XI.

### THE PRE-EXISTENCE OF CHRIST.

I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world. Again I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples said unto him, Lo, now speakest thou plainly, and speakest no proverb. John xvi. 29.

HAVING already shown, that "Christ Jesus *came into the world* to save sinners," or in other words that he was the foretold Messiah from his birth; and further, that he "was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary;" we now advance another step, to prove his previous existence with God in some form or other before he was born into the world. No argument is wanted here, inasmuch as the objections, which are raised against our Lord's Deity, do not affect the question of his pre-existence. It will take us but a very short time to adduce the few passages of Scripture that are required for the proof; but as the question is a distinct one of itself, it appeared better to bring forward the evidence for it in a separate Lecture, instead of intermixing it with the proofs of Christ's Godhead.

Let us then begin with the testimony of John the Baptist.

John i. 30. "This is he, of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me: *for he was before me.*" John here states the pre-existence of Jesus to be one ground on which he had a right to higher honour than himself.

John iii. 30, 31. "He must increase but I must decrease. He that *cometh from above* is above all; he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth: he that *cometh from heaven* is above all." If any one should think that the expressions "cometh from above" and "cometh from heaven" may only mean commissioned or sent by God, I would remind them that John himself was sent by God; and yet he is here showing the *difference* between himself and Jesus, one of whom was "of the earth," and the other "from heaven." If then "coming from heaven" means that Jesus was sent by God, "being of the earth" must mean that John was *not* sent by God—which is manifestly false.

Equally strong are the words of Jesus himself.

John iii. 13. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that *came down from heaven*, even the Son of Man, which is

in heaven." We shall have occasion to consider the latter part of the verse another time. At present we have only to do with our Lord's statement that he "came down from heaven"; which, from being joined to the words "ascended up to heaven," must evidently be taken literally. I don't know whether Mr. Barker adopts the *supposition*, that Jesus went up to heaven after his baptism and came down again: I should think he scarcely could, from his horror of "theological fictions" invented "to help people out of their difficulties."

John vi. 33. "For the bread of God is he, which *cometh down from heaven*, and giveth life unto the world."

John viii. 14. "For I know *whence I came*, and whither I go; but ye cannot tell *whence I come* and whither I go." Whence then *did* he come?

John vi. 62. "What and if ye shall see the Son of Man *ascend up where he was before*?" On this passage Dr. Priestly, not being satisfied with any of the attempted explanations, says that, rather than believe Jesus to have claimed a pre-existence, he would suppose that St. John did not hear quite correctly what Jesus said, or that the secretary, who was writing the gospel under John's dictation, put something in of his own accord. What a remarkably useful book the Bible must be on this principle!

John viii. 42. "I proceeded forth and came from God." Did any prophet ever claim to have "proceeded forth" from God? Mr. Barker tries to get over all these passages by quoting a line from one of Wesley's Hymns, in which he speaks of his converts as "born from the skies." But did John Wesley, or any one else in his senses, ever say that regenerate persons "proceeded forth and came from God," that they "came out from the Father," that they "came forth from the Father," that they "came down from heaven," and that when they go to heaven they "ascend up where they were before"?

John xiii. 3. "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands, and that he *was come from God*, and went to God." Here the close connection between coming from God and going to God shows that, if one is taken literally, the other must be taken so too. Now no one will deny that Jesus actually "went to God"; therefore he must have actually, not figuratively, "come from God." Besides, the authority Jesus received from God is mentioned in the words immediately before, "knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands": but he knew something more than this—"and that he was come from God."

John xvi. 28, 29. "*I came forth from the Father*, and *am come into the world*: again I leave the world, and go to the Father. His disciples say unto him, Lo, now speakest thou



plainly, and speakest no proverb." If Jesus in those words did not mean to say that he was with the Father before he came into the world, instead of his speaking with more than usual plainness, as the disciples seemed to think, he never said any thing more difficult or obscure in his life.

John xvii. 5. "And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory *which I had with thee before the world was.*" No comment can either add to, or take from, the force of this.

John xvii. 8. "And they have received them; and have known surely that I *came out from thee*, and they have believed that thou didst send me." The Apostles are here said to believe two things; 1st, that Jesus "came out from" God; and 2ndly, that he was sent by God.

John xvii. 24. "For thou lovedest me before the foundation of the world."

What can induce any one to resist such positive declarations as these, I am at a loss to conceive: unless it be a determination to degrade the person of the Saviour to the lowest possible point. That "the natural man" should be staggered by some of the difficulties connected with Christ's Deity or the Atonement, is not at all to be wondered at: but as to his pre-existence, there is not a shadow of an excuse to be made for disbelieving it. Indeed the great bulk of those who denied our Lord's Deity in the first seventeen centuries, always contended that he had a pre-existence as the Son of God, though not as God. But the tendency of error is to sink lower and lower; and few in the present day are satisfied with Arianism. Even those who begin with it like Dr. Priestly, generally end like him with the lowest kind of Unitarianism.

## LECTURE XII.

### THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

He that *seeth* the Son, and believeth on him, shall have everlasting life.—  
John vi. 40.

THIS text alone, if there were not another such in the whole Bible, would be quite enough to shew, that the question at issue between Unitarians and orthodox Christians concerning the person of Christ is no mere speculative point; but one of nothing less than *vital* importance. Our Lord here declares it to be essential to everlasting life, not only that we should believe on him as far as we knew him, but that we should *know him aright*—that we should “see” him. As no one will contend, that Christ’s mission was confined to those who saw him with their bodily eyes, I know not what meaning can possibly be attached to the ‘seeing the Son,’ except—spiritually discerning, perceiving, or understanding, his person and office. Now the Unitarian and Trinitarian cannot both do this. They may both believe on him, according to their own apprehension of his person and office; but they cannot both have a *right* apprehension of them; they cannot both spiritually “see the Son.” Let us then in this lecture examine with all the attention, which its importance demands, what view scripture gives us of the *person* of Jesus Christ: and let us humbly seek the Spirit’s teaching, to guide us right, as in a matter of life and death. Let us remember, that “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know, because they are spiritually discerned;” and that therefore the Spirit must take of the things of Christ, and shew them to us, or we shall remain for ever blind. John xvi. 15.

But before entering on the examination, we must endeavour to clear our minds of any difficulties, that human reason may have laid in the way, about the impossibility of a God-man. Into what opposite extremes may the same principle lead us!—when the principle is a false one. The Swedenborgian of modern days, or the Apollinarian of earlier times, says, I see clear and decisive evidence in scripture for the Godhead of Jesus; and therefore, as I do not see how the

same person can be both God and man, I conclude that he only bore the appearance of a man, and the texts which seem to assert his Manhood must be thus explained. The Unitarian on the other hand says, I see clear and decisive evidence in scripture for the Manhood of Jesus; and therefore, as I do not see how the same person can be both God and man, I feel compelled to give some other *rational* interpretation to those texts, which seem to assert his Godhead. The orthodox Christian replies, I admit both your premises, and deny both your conclusions. The Swedenborgian is perfectly right as to the positive declarations of scripture concerning the Godhead of Christ; and the Unitarian is equally right as to its no less positive declarations concerning the Manhood of Christ; but why explain *either* of them away? Why not admit the truth of them both; and acknowledge the natural conclusion, that Godhead and Manhood were united in the person of Jesus? Oh, they exclaim, It is impossible: we are both agreed about that. But why is it impossible? How do you know it is? Does the Bible tell you, that Godhead and Manhood *could not* meet in one being? No; but our reason tells us so. Does it indeed? Pray exercise it a little. Does your reason tell you, that God, who is in himself invisible, *could not* manifest or render himself visible to his creatures, in any shape or form whatever? No; of course God can do all things. Then supposing that God for reasons of his own did choose to manifest himself in some form or other, what shadow of a *reason* can you give, why such a form as the human body should be a less likely one for him to choose, than any other conceivable form whatever? Does it seem too small for him? Why one a million times as large would be just as small compared with the *infinite* Jehovah. Can your reason prove, that infinite wisdom could have chosen any other more appropriate size, to be neither above, nor below, the ken of any single intelligent creature? Can your reason prove, that the human form is not the most perfect form in the universe? or that Adam was not made "in the image" of that form, in which God had determined to manifest himself to his creatures;—"the figure of him that was to come?" If you had always lived in a world of spirits, would your reason have told you it was impossible, that the same being could be both body and soul? If you had then seen a book, relating the history of a creature called *man*, which sometimes spoke of his body and sometimes spoke of his soul—would your reason have told you to explain away one half of these expressions, because it could not understand *how* a "reasonable soul and body" were "one man?" Or descending lower to the common matters of daily life (from which Jesus so loved to draw his illustrations, because he knew they were the easiest to be understood

by the poor and unlearned)—would your reason have been able to conceive, if you had never seen it, *how* two such different natures as fire and iron could be united in one thing? Tell me, ye that are staggered by the mystery of incarnate Deity, What is a red-hot cannon ball? Fire, or iron? Come, exercise your reason; and answer. Does *iron* give *light* and *heat*? or does *fire* possess *weight* and *hardness*? Does not reason tell you, that here are two natures, with scarce a property alike, united in one thing; yet neither of them losing its identity, but preserving each its own character and properties, as distinct as ever? And if so, never utter such a libel against her again, as to say she tells you, that Godhead and Manhood cannot be united in one person; and never bring forward texts, which assert Christ's Deity, as arguments against his humanity; or texts which assert his humanity, as arguments against his Deity.

The best method perhaps of taking the scripture evidence on this subject will be to go at once to the New Testament; inasmuch as most of the Old Testament evidence is there referred to, and so will come before us with inspired authority for its application to Christ. Let us begin then by examining whether there are any intimations of the dignity of the person who was to come after him, to be found in the preaching of John the Baptist. There are very few of his sayings recorded, and the main burden of his preaching, we are told, was repentance; yet even from him we have very decided evidence on the point.

Matt. iii. 11. "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."—"Now let us consider how ought Jews to have understood this saying? No one can doubt that they received the Old Testament scriptures as the inspired word of God. Those scriptures speak of this very matter, and ascribe the outpouring of the Spirit to Him who is both God and man. 'And I will pour out upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Spirit of grace and of supplication; and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for Him as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him as one that is in bitterness for his first-born.' Zech. xii. 10. Here we have the pierced One, the outpourer of the Spirit, the changer of the hearts of that nation who had crucified him, and have continued to hate and reject him for 1800 years. If we examine the context, we shall find that this pierced One is Jehovah, the Creator, 'which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth, and formeth the spirit of man within him.' Verse 1.

“Baptizing with the Holy Ghost was an idea familiar to the Jewish prophets. We find it again in Ezekiel, in especial connection with the renewal of the heart of Israel. ‘Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new Spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you an heart of flesh. And I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments, and do them.’ Ezek. xxxvi. 25—27.

“To the same purpose Isaiah speaks of the man who was marred in visage above all men, as the highly exalted out-pourer of the Spirit upon all nations. ‘Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. As many were astonished at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men: so shall he sprinkle many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider.’ Isa. lii. 13—15.

“Joel speaks of the same blessing which Peter assures us had its incipient fulfilment at Pentecost, when Jesus had ascended up on high. ‘And it shall come to pass afterward, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions.’ Joel ii. 28.

“Bringing those passages to bear upon the Baptist’s declaration, ‘He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost,’ a mind unprejudiced could not but acknowledge that Jesus was declared by him to be that Being spoken of by the prophets, as both God and man.

“It cannot be objected that Jesus did not assent to what John said, for our Lord’s words are in answer to his declaration ‘I have need to be baptized of thee,’ an office which he declared as his, in saying to the woman of Samaria ‘he would have given thee living water.’ John iv. 10.

“And now let us consider what it is to baptize with the Holy Ghost. It is to pour out the Divine power upon man, in renewing the heart, in enlightening, cheering, sustaining, and guiding. It is to help in prayer, to deliver in danger, to purify the thoughts, to subdue the unruly wills and passions of sinful men. It is to be wise enough to understand the wants, and rich enough to supply the moral and spiritual necessities of a whole world. It is to give to a prophet his discernment, to an apostle his healing power, to the wise his wisdom, and to the ruler his diligence. It is to fill the world with the manifold grace of God.

"And such is the work of Him of whose fulness have all we received, and grace for grace. John i. 16.

"Let him who has endeavoured to guide and govern one family say what must be the power, skill, and wisdom of Him who is to guide and bless a world. This thought is capable of an expansion which would fill a volume rather than make a paragraph in an essay. I shall therefore leave it to the reader's prayerful meditation. Let him contemplate Jesus as the baptizer with the Holy Ghost, and then seriously ask himself, Who can Jesus be?

"Farther, he was to baptize with fire. This also is an image borrowed from the Prophets. 'He is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap.' Mal. iii. 2. The dispenser of those fiery trials which are to purify his people. 'Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you.' 1 Peter iv. 12. 'I have chosen thee in the furnace of affliction.' The manner of doing so is described by another prophet. 'He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness.' Mal. iii. 3.

"To take even one human being and baptize him with fire is a work far exceeding human skill; that is, so to regulate all his circumstances as to give him the exact amount of trial and sorrow which his case needs. In order to this his whole case must be known: what are the events just suited to purify his heart, to meet his feelings, to subdue his self-will, to assimilate his character to God's holiness. There must also be power to control the actions and wills of other men, so as to bring their influence to bear upon him at exactly the right time, and in the best way, so as to result in his spiritual good. It is a power which must be exercised in absence, unseen, unfelt, and unknown by those who are its subjects. Would the holiest and wisest of men undertake such an office towards a single individual? What would we think of Moses, or Paul, or Peter, or John, yea, or of the whole college of Apostles and Prophets undertaking to do so towards the very meanest believer? And yet here is one who performs it towards all who ever have or ever shall have attained to heavenly purity. His therefore is a wisdom capable of understanding the exact character and circumstances of all human beings, a power able to regulate and control all human events, and a skill able to make them all result in everlasting good to them that love God.

"Reader! who is that Being?"\*

\* Prophetic Herald.

John iii. 29. "He that hath the Bride is the Bridegroom." Jesus is here represented as the Bridegroom of the Church; which indeed he continually is, in the New Testament. But in Is. liv. 5, we read, "Thy *Maker* is thy *husband*; the Lord of hosts is his name; and thy *Redeemer* the Holy one of Israel; the God of the whole earth shall he be called." Was the Jewish Church the bride of the Lord of Hosts? and is the Christian Church but the bride of "a pious young man?"

Such was the testimony of John the Baptist. Let us now see how far Jesus himself by his words and actions asserted his own claims to Deity. But "in examining the Lord's teaching we must bear in mind the manner in which he could be likely to unfold the truth respecting himself. He came in the humble garb of a poor man, an ordinary mechanic. And yet he declares he existed before Abraham, and had glory with the Father before the world was. His outward appearance then would be a disguise. He was in very truth what he appeared to be, but he was also something more. It was not as man that he could have had glory with the Father before the world was. If therefore it pleased his Divine wisdom to come in a garb so little, to our view, agreeable with his pre-existing glory, it is not reasonable to object that his teaching says so little about his glory or his Deity. It is obviously reasonable to expect that the truth respecting himself would be gradually unfolded. In this point of view a candid inquirer will be struck with the fact that Jesus claimed so much from the very outset of his ministry."\*

The first passage then we shall bring forward is from our Lord's sermon on the Mount. Unitarians are very fond of appealing to this discourse, and asking where we can find the Trinity, his own Deity, the Atonement, &c., &c., in Christ's preaching. Now without alluding to other answers, which might be given to this objection, but which would lead us into subjects unconnected with the present lecture, we will content ourselves with the four following:—First; if nothing is essential to Christianity but what Jesus taught in direct words in that sermon, it cannot be essential to Christianity to "believe that Jesus is the Christ," (which is Mr. Barker's definition of a Christian;) *for Jesus there says not one single word about his being Messiah or Christ.* He implies it, if you like; and I shall shew you, in my fourth answer, that he implies something more. Secondly; if every thing necessary to be known and believed was fully and distinctly taught there, what could be the use of all the rest of the Bible? why should the Evangelists have thought it necessary to record any other of his discourses? Thirdly; Jesus himself tells his disciples, that

he had *not* either in his sermon on the Mount, or in any other, fully and distinctly taught all that it was necessary for them to know; "I have many things to tell you, but ye cannot bear them now." But nevertheless—Fourthly; we do find most, if not every, doctrine of the gospel implied or alluded to in Christ's teaching, in such a way that, when the Apostles were fully enlightened by the Holy Ghost, they could see the real meaning of their master's words: which in fact we are told was the case. Now in this particular instance of the sermon on the Mount, there is not an essential doctrine of the gospel that Jesus did not add his testimony to, when he said, "Think not, that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." In these words, Jesus declares the infallible truth of the whole of the Old Testament. But the Old Testament taught, that Jehovah was Triune, that the Messiah would be God-man, that he would be born of a virgin, atone for the sins of the world, &c, &c; so that when we "search for the knowledge of God as *hid treasure*" in this favourite discourse of Unitarians, we actually find the doctrines of the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, his Miraculous Conception, the Atonement, man's fallen nature,—in fact every thing that is taught from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Malachi.

This however is a digression; the particular passage I wish to call your attention to being that part of the sermon contained in the 11th and 12th verses of the 8th chapter of St. Matthew; "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad; for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you." "Men were to submit to all manner of persecution *for his sake*; a persecution similar to that which the Jewish prophets had suffered. Now the persecution of the Jewish prophets is never said to have been for their own sakes or for Moses' sake. They recalled the people to the true knowledge of God, and rebuked them for their immoralities. They brought upon themselves persecution: but it was not for Moses' sake; *it was for the Lord's sake.*"

So much for the sermon on the Mount. Immediately on his coming down, a circumstance occurred, which presents Jesus to us in two important aspects; *as receiving worship*, and *working a miracle*. "And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him,



saying, I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed." Matt. viii. 2, 3. These two points will be considered in order.

I. JESUS RECEIVES WORSHIP.—What did Peter say, when the Centurion attempted to worship him? "Stand up; *I myself also am a man*" Acts x. 26. What did the angel say, when St. John fell down to worship him? "See thou do it not: *for I am thy fellow-servant*, and of thy brethren the prophets, and of them which keep the sayings of this book; *worship God.*" Rev. xxii. 9. Now if St. Peter's being "*a man*," and the angel's being St. John's "*fellow-servant*," were sufficient reasons for their not accepting worship, why did Jesus accept it? Why did he not say to this leper, Stand up; *I myself also am a man*; or, See thou do it not: *for I am thy fellow-servant*, and of thy brethren the prophets; worship God? Or why did he not say as he did to the tempter, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *him only* shalt thou serve." And this was not a solitary instance; Jesus habitually received worship, and always, either by word or deed, expressed his approbation of it. If instances need be specified, take the following. "There came a ruler, and *worshipped* him, &c. Matt. ix. 18—25. "They that were in the ship *worshipped* him, saying, Of a truth thou art the Son of God." Matt. xiv. 33. Does not this shew, that more was understood by the expression "*Son of God*" than Unitarians suppose?—"Then came she and *worshipped* him, saying, Lord help me." Matt. xv. 25—28.—"And they came, and held him by the feet, and *worshipped* him" Matt. xxviii. 9—"And when they saw him, they *worshipped* him; but some doubted." Matt. xxviii. 17. Now if Jesus thus accepted, and approved of, Divine worship being paid him, when in his state of humiliation, in "the form of a servant," "despised and rejected of men,"—is it rational to suppose, that such worship is to be withheld from him now that he is sitting "at the right hand of the majesty on high?" But we need not appeal to reason; for scripture decides for us. We read in Luke xxiv. 52, that after his ascension the disciples "*worshipped* him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God." Why the honour they paid to their ascended master is expressed here in actually stronger terms than that which they rendered to God. Well might St. Paul say, "We *serve* the Lord Christ." Col. iii. 24. We learn then most unquestionably from scripture, that Jesus was worshipped and served when on earth, and that he is to be worshipped and served now: but—"Thou shalt *worship the Lord thy God*, and *him only* shalt thou serve." The conclusion which this leads us to will be strengthened, if we remember Jehovah's words "My glory will I not give to another."

Jesus must either have been guilty of the most blasphemous presumption, and his disciples of the most flagrant idolatry,—or else he is *not* “another.”

But here we are met by a very confident assertion from Mr. Barker, and rather a staggering one, if true—that Jesus positively forbids us praying to him; which is of course an essential part of worship. The text brought forward is “In that day ye shall ask me nothing.” John xvi. 23. And on the strength of this single passage, he coolly throws overboard the whole body of scriptural evidence on the other side, saying, “If Stephen, or any one else, did pray to Christ, they disobeyed his plain command.” This is certainly a very summary mode of settling an argument; though scarcely in the spirit of our Lord’s direction, “Search the scriptures,” or of St. Paul’s “comparing spiritual things with spiritual.” But what if we find, that this text, which is to overthrow such an array of witnesses, *has nothing whatever to do with the matter!* Let us examine it. “In that day ye shall ask me nothing.” The first question is, In *what* day? The context leaves no doubt of this; “And ye now therefore have sorrow: *but I will see you again*, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you. And in *that* day ye shall ask me nothing.” The time then, of which Jesus is speaking, is the time of his second coming, when they would “enter into the joy of their Lord.” Now if Mr. Barker will open his Greek Testament, and turn to this place, he will see in a moment, (if he knows the Greek language) that not only is Jesus speaking of a time yet future, but that he is not speaking of *prayer* being offered to him at all. The English reader will observe, that the word “ask” in our language is used in two distinct senses—to *enquire*, and to *beg* or *pray*. For instance—“I *asked* him what he meant;” here the word means “I *enquired* of him, &c. :” but—“I *asked* him for a bit of bread” means, “I *begged*, besought, entreated, or prayed, him, &c.” In the Greek language however the same word has not these distinct meanings; but two different words are used; one (*erotao*) to enquire; the other (*aiteo*) to beg. Now in the passage before us, the first of these words is used, which has nothing whatever to do with prayer; “In that day ye shall ask (or enquire of) me nothing.” Although not a doubt can be raised about the meaning of the Greek word, it may to an English reader confirm what we have said, to go a few verses back and see what led to our Lord’s using these words. “Now Jesus knew that they were desirous to *ask* (*erotao*) him, and said unto them, Do ye enquire among yourselves of that I said, A little while, and ye shall not see me: and again a little while, and ye shall see me: Verily, verily, I say unto you, That ye shall weep and lament, but the world shall rejoice: and ye shall be

sorrowful, but your sorrow shall be turned into joy. A woman when she is in travail hath sorrow, because her hour is come; but as soon as she is delivered of the child, she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world. And ye now therefore have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you. In that day ye shall *ask* (*erotao*) me nothing." The connection between the word "*ask*" in the first and last of these verses must be evident to every one; and equally evident, one would think, Christ's meaning. "In that day" it would no longer be necessary for him to speak to them "in parables and dark sayings," nor would any remaining cloud darken their understandings; so that they would not have to enquire among themselves, or enquire of him, the meaning of what he said, for they would "see even as they were seen, and know even as they were known."—"In that day ye shall (have to) *ask* (enquire of) me nothing." I need only add, that even if you are not satisfied with the above interpretation, the meaning of the Greek word is certain; whatever the passage means, it can have nothing to do with *prayer*. The next sentence however, which ought to begin a new paragraph—"Whatsoever ye shall *ask* the Father in my name, he will give it you"—does speak of prayer; for there the Greek word translated '*ask*' is *aiteo*, which means to beg or pray. The English reader does not perceive the change, but connects the two together; partly because of their being in the same verse, and partly because of the word *erotao* to enquire and *aiteo* to pray, both being translated '*ask*.' This connection of ideas in the mind naturally leads to the conclusion, that Jesus forbids prayer being made to him; but on turning to the original, the difficulty at once vanishes. This should teach us an important lesson; to "compare spiritual things with spiritual," and not to run away with an inference from a single text, which contradicts the whole tenour of scripture; but endeavour by diligent searching and prayer to harmonise them together. The case before us is a very striking one; which will be fully seen, as we proceed to examine some of those instances of prayer being addressed to Jesus, which Mr. Barker so easily dispenses with, by saying, If they did so, they disobeyed Christ's command—"In that day ye shall ask me nothing."

We shall select two while our Lord was on earth, and three after his ascension. The first is that of his disciples in Luke xvii. 5, "Lord, increase our faith;" and the second that of the dying thief in Luke xxiii. 42, "Lord remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom;" to which Jesus replied "To day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Is it possible for any one to conceive of God as the object of prayer in a higher sense than Jesus is presented to us in these two cases?

especially when, in connection with the first, we remember the Apostle's words, "By grace are ye saved, through *faith*; and that not of yourselves, it is *the gift of God*." Eph. ii. 8.

These were "while he was yet with them." After his ascension we find Stephen with his last breath "calling upon God, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts vii. 59. Now you will see, by its being printed in italics in our Bible, that the word 'God' is not in the original. It is put in the translation, because the Greek word for 'calling upon' is always used in reference to God; which affords a strong argument for the Deity of Jesus, as *he* is evidently the person here called upon or invoked. Further; when Jesus died, he gave up his spirit to *God*, saying, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit"; while Stephen, we see, gave up his to *Jesus*. Therefore, if Jesus be not God, Stephen when dying did not follow the example of Christ. But how could this be, when at the very time he was "full of the Holy Ghost"? Strange that a man "full of the Holy Ghost" should in his last moments act so contrary both to "the plain command" and the equally plain example of his Master!

The three next are from St. Paul. "For this thing I besought *the Lord* thrice, that it might depart from me. And he said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my infirmities, that the power of *Christ* may rest upon me." 2 Cor. xii. 8, 9. If there could be any doubt as to the meaning of "the Lord", the last part of the sentence proves that *Christ* was the person "besought". And lastly, observe how Christ and the Father are unitedly prayed to, in the two following passages; "Now God himself, and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you." 1 Thess. iii. 11. "Now our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even our Father, which hath loved us, and hath given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts and stablish you in every good word and work." 2 Thess. ii. 16, 17. Paul well knew the meaning of his Master's words, "Whatsoever ye ask in my name, *I will do it*"; and he taught us by example as well as by precept, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth."

Having thus seen Jesus in one character, as an object of worship, the hearer and answerer of prayer, we proceed to notice the second character, in which this incident presents him to us—

#### AS A WORKER OF MIRACLES.

"I will; be thou clean. And immediately his leprosy was cleansed."

Now to bring forward the mere fact of Christ's working miracles as a proof of his Godhead, would be manifestly unsound; because Prophets and Apostles did the same: and however stupendous were Christ's miracles, it is quite clear, that God *could* have given any man the same power, if he pleased; nay, Jesus promised his disciples, that if they had faith they should "do greater things than these." Besides which, we should be at once reminded, and justly, that Jesus disclaimed working them by his power, and attributed them all to the power of God. My own view is, whether right or not I cannot say, that it was *as man* he worked miracles; in the character of God's "servant," "the messenger of the covenant," &c.; and when acting in this capacity, all his power of course emanated from, and was dependent on, the Godhead. Still, notwithstanding all this, there was a very marked difference in the *manner* of his working miracles from that of either prophets or apostles; so marked, that we cannot doubt of there being some important meaning in it: and it is to this I would now direct your attention.

In order to obtain as accurate a view as possible of the subject, I have examined all the miracles of the New Testament, and I believe most of the Old. The result is as follows.\* In every instance but that of Lazarus, (unless his "looking up to heaven" in Mark vii. 34, be considered as an outward sign of prayer,) Jesus performed his miracles in some such authoritative way as the following, without any reference to a higher power than his own: "I will; be thou clean." Matt. viii. 3. "I will come and heal him\*\*\* Go thy way, and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee." Matt. viii. 7—13. "Arise, take up thy bed and go unto thine house." Matt. ix. 6. "Believe ye that *I am able* to do this? They said unto him, Yea Lord, Then touched he their eyes, saying, According to your faith be it unto you" Matt. ix. 28, 29. "Young man, I say unto thee arise." Luke vii. 14. For the peculiar manner which he adopted in raising Lazarus from the dead there were doubtless good reasons, though they may not be very evident to us. A similiarity has often struck me between the way in which he was applied to for help, and the way in which he gave it. The Leper says "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean;" Jesus answers, "I will; be thou clean." Martha says, "I know that even now whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." Jesus at the grave-side says "Father I thank thee that thou hast heard me, &c." Yet even here he informs us, that it was only "because of the people which stood by" he said it; and then he concludes in his usual man-

\* It is quite possible of course, that one or two may have been overlooked; but if so, I am sure there are not enough to weaken the general conclusion.

ner, "Lazarus come forth." Now of all the miracles recorded in the Old Testament I only remember one case of a prophet coming any thing near to the—"I will; be thou clean"—of Jesus; and in that one instance we are told that he "spake unadvisedly with his lips," that the Lord was wroth with him, and punished him for his presumption: I allude of course to the speech of Moses at the rock Horeb, "Hear ye rebels: shall *we* bring water out of the rock for you?" Even Elijah's attempt to raise up a dead child by sending his servant with his stick had, it seems, too much assumption of authority about it; for the attempt failed. Let us then turn to the New Testament, and see if the Apostles came at all nearer their master in their manner of working miracles. Now the first one recorded is in the 3rd Chapter of Acts; and we there find Peter ascribing the power by which the miracle was wrought neither to himself, nor to the Father, but to Jesus! "In the name of *Jesus Christ of Nazareth* rise up and walk."—Acts iii. 6. Again in Acts ix. 34. "Peter said unto him, *Æneas, Jesus Christ* maketh thee whole." If in these cases, and others which might be mentioned, the power was only communicated *through* Jesus from the Father, as it was communicated through the Apostles from Jesus, why should they not have referred the power to its true source, and given the glory of it to the Father instead of to Jesus? There is however one remarkable exception to the usual apostolic manner of performing miracles to be found in Acts xiv. 9, 10. "The same heard Paul speak; who stedfastly beholding him, and perceiving that he had faith to be healed, said with a loud voice, Stand upright on thy feet." This indeed reminds us forcibly of his master's authoritative way of saying "I will; be thou clean," "Arise and walk." And what follows? Why the very same impression is produced on the minds of the bystanders, that we contend is conveyed by Christ's manner of working a miracle; "When the people saw what Paul had done, they lifted up their voices, saying in the speech of Lycaonia, *The Gods are come down to us in the likeness of men:*" and Paul and Barnabas had some difficulty to prevent them offering sacrifices to them as Gods. Paul doubtless had no intention of taking any honour to himself; but the result shews the impression produced by neglecting that specific reference to a higher power, which was so usual with Prophets and Apostles, so unusual with Jesus Christ.

Let us now follow the gospel narrative. In the same chapter, we read that "another of his disciples said unto him, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my Father. But Jesus said unto him, Follow me, and let the dead bury their dead." With this may be joined the following: "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me: and he

that loveth son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me. He that findeth his life shall lose it: and he that loseth his life for my sake shall find it." Matt. x. 37—39. "If any man come to me, and hate\* not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." Luke xiv. 26. Can any one read these, and such like, passages, without perceiving that Jesus claims for himself that supreme affection of "all the heart, and mind, and soul, and strength," which is due to God alone? Who but God has a right to demand such undivided love as is here described; to the entire putting aside for his sake of the claims of our nearest and dearest relatives?

Matt. viii. 8. "The Centurion answered and said, Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come under my roof; but speak the word only and my servant shall be healed." "The observations made upon our Lord's reception of homage from the leper apply to the case of the Centurion, with the additional circumstance of the difference of character between the two men, and the deeper acknowledgment of inferiority on the part of the latter. The one was an outcast, and defiled; the other was a lover of Israel, and highly respected. For him the elders of the Jews "besought Jesus instantly," alleging the Centurion's worthiness. Such a man says to Jesus, "I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof." Here, then, was a homage which we find no other servant of God accepting. Jesus was meek and lowly in heart, and yet he accepted all this. He tells the people of the greatness of the Centurion's faith, and proposes the same for their imitation. This is the more instructive, because the homage was so directly given to the person of Jesus. It is not like what Martha said, "I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee." It was to himself, "That *thou* shouldest come under my roof." It was faith in his power, even at a distance which would render human help unavailing; it was in his all-prevailing power. And Jesus praised his faith, and owned and blessed it."†

Matt. viii. 26. "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" Of some of our blessed Lord's miracles, cavillers have endeavoured to find a solution in the imagination of diseased persons, and have not feared to ascribe his power to the amount of their confidence in him, without any divine interposition.

In the case of the tempest there is no room for any such reasoning. Jesus was asleep, the little vessel was foundering

\* This is a common Hebrew mode of expression, to denote a decided preference of one thing to another. See Rom. ix. 13.

† Prophetic Herald.

from the overwhelming water and the violent tempest, the disciples were terrified: "they awoke him, saying, Lord, save us; we perish." Here, again, it is Jesus personally that is the object of faith. We read of no prayer to God, we read of no entreaty that he would assist them in the management of the ship. Nothing of the kind. It is simple desire for the exertion of his supernatural power.

"Remark, then, how Jesus received this trembling faith in him. "Why are ye fearful?" We may well ask the Unitarians, Why should they not be fearful? Is human goodness privileged with security from the common ills of life? Or did God never allow his servants to be overwhelmed with the waters? No, no: there must be far other reasons sought for. Jesus questions, Why are ye fearful? His rebuke, O ye of little faith, implies a claim to be Lord over both winds and waves. "He rebuked the winds and the sea: and there was a great calm." No wonder that they should say "What manner of man is this?"\*

Matt. xi. 10. "For this is he, of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face; which shall prepare *thy* way before *thee*." This prophecy then foretold John the Baptist as the forerunner of *Jesus*. But on turning to it in Mal. iii. 1, we find he is represented as the forerunner of *Jehovah*; "Behold I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before *me*."

Matt. xi. 27. "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him." In what sense could it be said that no one but the Father *knew the Son*, except in reference to his eternal co-equal sonship, as one person in the ever-blessed Trinity? Or how could it be said that no one but the Son *knew the Father*, if only such knowledge was meant, as a creature may have of the Creator? Was every one but Jesus ignorant of God? See also John x. 15. "As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father"

Matt. xii. 8. "For the Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." In Ex. xx. 10 we read "The seventh day is *the Sabbath of the Lord thy God*." Yet Jesus represents himself as Lord *even* of that Sabbath day.

Matt. xviii. 20. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." If two or three Christians are thus met together at the same time in different parts of the world, how can Jesus be in the midst of them all, unless he be God?

\* Prophetic Herald.



Matt. xix. 16, 17. "And behold one came and said unto him, Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God." Jesus here tells this young ruler, that the title, by which he has just addressed him, can only properly be given to *God*. But in John x. 14 he says, "I am *the good shepherd*," and in Matt. xxiii. 10, "One is your *Master*, even Christ;" thus giving himself the very name, which he here declares to belong to God alone. How then could he object to the young ruler calling him by that name? He did not object to it. He simply asked him the question, Why callest thou me good? reminding him at the same time, that there is but one good, that is, God—in order to test his faith, and if he did believe, to give him an opportunity of confessing it.

Matt. xxii. 41—45. "While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? They say unto him, The son of David. He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord, sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool? If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?" The answer to this question Jesus gives himself, in Rev. xxii. 16, when he says "I am the *root* and the *offspring* of David." As God, he was David's *Lord*, and the *root* from which David sprang, in other words his maker: as man, he was David's *son*, and David's *offspring*.

Matt. xxiii. 37. "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not." If any one can doubt that this is the language of Deity, let him turn to such passages as Ps. xci. 4. "He shall cover thee with his feathers, and under his wings shalt thou trust,"—Ps. lxi. 4. "I will trust in the covert of thy wings," and he will see that this is the language commonly applied in the Old Testament to *God's* protecting care over his people. Nothing can be clearer, than that Jesus referred to the numberless times *he* had called them to repentance, and promised them every blessing, by the mouth of his prophets.

Matt. xxv. 31. "When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." With which join Zech. xiv. 5. "*The Lord my God* shall come, and all the saints with thee." 1 Thess. iii. 13. "At the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." 1 Thess. iv. 14. "Them also which sleep in Jesus will *God bring with him*." How evidently is it the same event and person, spoken of in all these passages!

Matt. xxvi. 31. "All ye shall be offended because of me this night; for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad. This refers us to the prophecy in Zech. xiii. 7. "Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against *the man that is my fellow*, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, &c." Therefore Jesus is the man that is God's *fellow*, or *equal*.

John i. 49, 50. "Nathaniel answered and said unto him, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel. Jesus answered and said unto him, Because I said unto thee, I saw thee under the fig tree, believest thou? thou shalt see greater things than these." Jesus then accepts the title of "King of Israel." But in Ps. lxxxix. 18, David says "The Holy one of Israel is our King." Observe too, what it was that convinced Nathaniel of his being "the Son of God" and "King of Israel,"—his possessing the Divine attribute of *omniscience*.

John iii. 13. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, *which is in heaven*." How could Jesus be in heaven at the very moment he was talking to Nicodemus upon earth, unless he were God as well as man?

John v. 22, 23. "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son: that all men should honour the Son, *even as they honour the Father*." But God said he would *not* give his "glory to another:" therefore Jesus is not "another."—A few verses afterwards he says, that the Father had "given him authority to execute judgment also, *because he was the Son of man*." What can be the meaning of this, if Jesus was nothing else but the Son of man, and never had been anything else? But when combined with the fact of his pre-existent Deity, the words have some meaning. Judgment was committed to him in his mediatorial capacity, "because" he condescended to *become* "the Son of man," to "humble himself," and appear in "the form of a servant."

John v. 37. "And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me. Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his shape." Jesus here refers them to the testimony which the Father gave concerning him at his baptism; when a voice from heaven was heard, saying, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased. He then tells them, that this was the only time they had ever heard the Father's voice. Whose voice then was it, which their fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob so often heard, when God appeared to them, and spoke with them? No doubt it was the Son's voice, who from the first acted the part of Mediator between God and his fallen creatures. This is confirmed by the fact of this person, who says "I am the God of Bethel," "I am

the God of your fathers, &c," being called the angel or messenger of God; on which we shall have to say more presently.

John viii. 57, 58. "Thou art not yet fifty years old; and hast thou seen Abraham? Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, *I am*." After all the efforts of Unitarian learning and ingenuity against this passage, it still remains just where it was. Our translation gives precisely the meaning of the original; and Christ's claim to have existed before Abraham is as positive as words can make it: besides being the only interpretation that will suit the context. Nor can any reason whatever be given for our Lord saying 'I am,' instead of 'I was,' except that he intended to assume to himself that name of self-existent eternity, by which Jehovah made himself known to Moses in the 3rd Chapter of Exodus; "And God said unto Moses, *I AM, THAT I AM*: and he said, Thus shalt thou say unto the children of Israel, *I AM* hath sent me unto you."

John x. 14. "I am *the good shepherd*." No wonder the unbelieving Jews said "This man hath a Devil, and is mad;" for their scriptures taught them to regard *God* as their shepherd—"The Lord (Jehovah) is my shepherd." Ps. xxiii. 1. Compare also the three following texts: "Know ye that the Lord he is God, it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves; we are his people, and *the sheep of his pasture*." Ps. c. 3. "Jesus saith unto him, Feed *my sheep*." John xxi. 17. "Feed *the flock of God* which is among you \* \* \* and when the *chief shepherd* shall appear, ye shall receive, &c." 1 Pet. v. 2-4. Jesus might be an under shepherd; but how, on the Unitarian theory, he could be "*the good shepherd*" and "*the chief shepherd*," when David says "The Lord is my shepherd," I am at a loss to conceive.

John xiv. 7-9. "If ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also; and from henceforth ye know him, *and have seen him*. Philip saith unto him, Lord show us the Father, and it sufficeth us. Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then show us the Father?" Now although the word "see" is often used figuratively to denote a spiritual perception or knowledge of any thing, yet I think no one can carefully read this whole conversation, and suppose it to be so used here. If by seeing God Jesus only means knowing him, why should he say, "from henceforth ye *know* him, *and have seen* him?" Nothing can be plainer, than Philip's question and our Lord's answer to it. Philip asks to see God: Jesus replies, After having been so long with me, hearing my words and seeing my works, have you not yet learnt, that *I am*

God? The only difficulty that can be raised is about the word Father. It may be said, that this would make Christ, God the Father. The two following remarks may furnish an answer to this and similar objections, which are made against other passages. First; the word Father sometimes in scripture means simply God, because he is the Father or Creator of all things (in which sense, as we shall show presently, Jesus is called "the everlasting Father;") while at other times it means only the first person of the Triune Godhead, as denoting the relation in which he stands to the second person. Secondly; although strictly speaking, the Son only became incarnate, yet "all the fullness of the Godhead dwelt in him bodily;" so intimate is the Unity between the three persons of the glorious Trinity, that to see one is to see the other, the thought or action of one is the thought or action of another, and the entire image of the invisible Godhead is seen in the face of the incarnate Son. "How mysterious and incomprehensible!" says some one. No doubt it is. I do not pretend to be able even "by searching" to "find out the Highest unto perfection." Difficulties will remain, when all has been said that can be said. "Why he leaves it in mystery by his own confession"—triumphantly exclaim a dozen pamphlets in a breath. Very true; but what do you gain by that? St. Paul made the same confession, about eight or ten times. And if either you or I preach any gospel which does not contain *unfathomable* mysteries, it is very clear that it cannot be the gospel *he* preached, but "another." Gal. i. 6.

John xiv. 26. "But the Comforter which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send *in my name*" If Jesus Christ be a created being, the Father is here represented as sending the Holy Ghost *in the name of one of his own creatures!!* Besides, in the next chapter Jesus says "the Comforter, whom *I* will send unto you from the Father."

John xx. 28, 29. "And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." Two attempts are made to get over this plain testimony; by suggesting, first, that this was a mere exclamation of surprise; in other words, that Thomas took his Maker's name in vain, in the presence of Jesus, and without rebuke; secondly, that the words mean, The Lord is my God—a meaning which is as totally opposed to the original, as it is to the English translation. In fact this is one of those proofs of our Lord's Deity, which no comment can either weaken or strengthen.

Matt. xxviii. 19. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—See lecture on Trinity.

To these must be added the testimony, which Jesus gives of himself to St. John in the book of Revelations.

Rev. i. 8—18. "I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, saith the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. \* \* \* I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last. \* \* \* And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like unto the Son of man. And he laid his right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth, and was dead; and behold, am alive for evermore."

Rev. ii. 23. "And all the churches shall know that I am *he* which searcheth the reins and the hearts." But Solomon addressing Jehovah, says "Thou, even thou *only*, knowest the hearts of all the children of men." 1 Kings viii. 39. Can those be Christian "churches" then, which do *not* "know" that Jesus is Jehovah?

Rev. xxi. 6, 7. "And he said unto me, It is done. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son." Here "Alpha and Omega," the name which *Jesus* gave himself in the first chapter, promises to be our "God."

Rev. xxii. 6. "*The Lord God* of the holy prophets sent *his* angel to show unto his servants things which must shortly be done." But in verse 16 we read "*I Jesus* have sent *mine* angel to testify unto you these things in the churches." Therefore Jesus is the Lord God of the holy prophets.

Such then is "the teaching of Christ" concerning his own person. We find that he claims to be—the Church's Bridegroom (although it is written, "Thy Maker is thy husband")—the good Shepherd (although David says, "The Lord is my Shepherd")—the I AM who appeared to Moses—the Lord and God of Thomas—the Lord God of the holy prophets—the God of his people—the searcher of hearts—the Lord of the Sabbath (though it is written "The seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God")—the Lord and root of David—the man that is God's fellow—and the Jehovah whose way John the Baptist was to prepare. We find further, that he claims that supreme affection which is due only to God; that he claims Divine worship, especially to be the hearer and answerer of prayer; that he claims the Divine attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence; and lastly that, as a confession of honouring him *even as* the Father, he commands his own name to be "put upon" all his disciples unitedly with that of

the other two persons in the Tri-une Godhead, by "baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."—Well might one of the greatest men of this age, the once Unitarian Coleridge, say, "If Jesus Christ was merely a man,—if he was not God, as well as man, he could not have been even a good man. There is no medium. The Saviour, in that case, was absolutely a deceiver."

Those who have been in the habit of taking upon credit the confident assertions so often made, that Christ never says a word about his own Godhead, may perhaps be rather surprised, on discovering the witness which he actually does bear of himself; and will learn in future, it is to be hoped, to follow the advice so strongly urged by Unitarians, and look for themselves. Let them remember too, that this evidence is all obtained from that very small specimen, given us in the Gospels, of the sayings of one, whose words, if they were told every one, St. John supposes in figurative language, "the world itself would not contain."

Another thing, which considerably increases its weight, is the very cautious and guarded way in which Jesus conducted himself during the whole of his three years' ministry. The Jews almost from the first were bent upon killing him; but as he had a work to do before his death, he would not give himself up to them "until his hour was come": he was therefore obliged to use the utmost prudence, neither to exasperate them needlessly, nor to allow them any handle for an accusation against him; and on more than one occasion had recourse to a miracle, that he might escape out of their hands. To have asserted his own Deity then prominently and positively on all occasions would have inevitably hurried on that crisis, which it was absolutely necessary should be deferred till the appointed time. Why he didn't do so even with regard to his *Messiahship*. Read his discourses, and you will find, that the fact of his being *the Christ* was by no means a prominent part of his teaching. If you will take the trouble of collecting together all his own claims to be the Messiah or Christ, I very much question whether you will be able to present at all a stronger array of evidence, than we have just produced for his Godhead. You will find throughout that, except when inculcating plain moral duties which no one could object to, his teaching was very much more by parable and *inference*, than by direct assertion. His instruction was given in such a manner, that those who came to catch him in his talk might be baffled, while those who were willing to learn might do so. "Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. But when Jesus knew it, *he withdrew himself from thence*: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; and charged them, *that they should not make*

*him known*: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my Spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles. *He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets.*" Matt. xii. 14—19. Again; "Then charged he his disciples, *that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ.*" Matt. xvi. 20. The transfiguration also was to be told to no man, till after his resurrection. Matt. xvii. 9. Considering all this, then, and remembering that he appeared on earth "in the form of a servant," "despised and rejected of men," "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," the only wonder is, that the proof of our Lord's Deity from his own mouth should be so complete and satisfactory.

But you have given a one-sided view of the question—it may be said: You have brought forward Christ's claims to Deity, but have not said a word about the numberless passages where he asserts his Manhood. No; because it is unnecessary: we are both agreed on that point. You admit that Jesus is very man; and therefore why should we waste our time in proving it? If we were Swedenborgians, and denied that Jesus was really and truly man, then no doubt you might bring forward with effect against us all those texts, in which he declares himself to be so, or in which he is represented as thinking, feeling, speaking or acting as man. But with the present controversy they have nothing whatever to do; for they only prove a fact, *which is as essential to our system, as it is to yours*—namely, that Jesus Christ was "very man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting." There are some places however in which he is thought not only to claim manhood, but also to disclaim Godhead: these will be examined presently. An important question first arises—What opinion did the Apostles form concerning the person of Christ? They had much better means of judging than we have. Instead of a few extracts from his discourses, and a brief account of a very small part of his doings, they heard and saw them all. Their judgment will of course have but little weight with those who agree with the father of modern Unitarianism, Dr. Priestly, in the opinion that "we are not bound to believe that Jesus created the world, because it was the opinion of an apostle." But those of my readers, who believe that "*all Scripture is given by inspiration of God,*" and that the Spirit of God speaking by the mouth of an Apostle, could no more err than the Son of God could when speaking by his own mouth, will have no difficulty in bowing their own reason and opinion to the written word, and acknowledging that it is much more likely for them to mistake the meaning of our Lord's words, than for the inspired Apostles to do so. We readily admit that the extent of their belief before the day of Pentecost is no rule for us; because, in the first place, Jesus continually charges them with blindness, ignorance, and unbe-

lief,—as for instance when conversing with two of them after his resurrection, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: ought not Christ to have suffered these things and to enter into his glory?”—and in the second place he distinctly told them that from the very nature of his own teaching in “parables and dark sayings,” as well as from their forgetfulness and stupidity, they would not have a clear knowledge of Divine truth, until the Holy Spirit was sent to teach them all things, to guide them into all truth, to bring to their remembrance whatever of his teaching they had forgotten, and to unfold the hidden meaning of what they had as yet not understood. John xiv. 26. xxi. 12. And when together with this we remember that Jesus solemnly declared our Salvation to be dependent on our believing the gospel which they were commissioned to preach “with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven,” it appears evident that a Christian must believe *more* than they did before the descent of the Holy Ghost, and *not less* than they did after that event. What opinion therefore the Apostles held about our Lord's person or work during his lifetime, is a question of more curiosity than importance. Some of them doubtless had clearer views than others: and even the same persons appear to have had much stronger impressions of Christ's dignity at one time than at another. For instance, Simon Peter, by the immediate revelation of God, made that confession on which Jesus said he would build his Church—“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God”: yet very shortly afterwards Satan was allowed so to work upon his feelings and the natural blindness of his heart, that he tempts his Master to avoid the cross—“This shall not be unto thee.” It may be questioned, whether the rock, on which Christ said he would build his Church, was the confession *as Peter understood it at the time*, or the confession *in its full scriptural meaning*. To confess that Jesus is “the Christ, the Son of the living God” is a comprehensive acknowledgment of him in all his offices as the Saviour of the world, including of course his Deity and Atonement. Now although these truths appear to have produced little permanent abiding impression upon Peter's mind, it is more than probable, considering the direct inspiration under which he is said to have spoken, that a larger measure of light was at that time vouchsafed to him, than was afforded to any of his fellow disciples, at least before the ascension. The secret source of the inconsistent conduct he so soon displayed was detected in his Master's rebuke—“Get thee behind me, *Satan*”; and is all of a piece with his conduct afterwards, when, having professed his, no doubt sincere, determination to follow Jesus to death, though all others should forsake him, he denied him the very next day with oaths and curses. But this question is of very secondary importance, inasmuch as we have the written testimony both of Peter himself and other Apostles *after* the Spirit had been sent down for the purpose of fully revealing to them



that Gospel which they were to preach among all nations, and which "he who believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved; he who believeth not shall be damned."

There is however a distinction to be observed in the Apostle's teaching even after the day of Pentecost. Let us suppose a case. A Christian Minister finds a company of Deists, who believe the bible to be a forgery, and Jesus Christ (if ever there was such a person) to have been an impostor. He enters into argument with them, in order if possible to convince them of their error. Now how will he begin? Will he begin with insisting on the Trinity, the Deity of Christ, or even the Atonement? Surely not. He will no doubt begin, either by speaking to their consciences and endeavouring to show them their own lost and ruined condition, or else by bringing before them the evidences for the simple historical facts of Christianity. To talk to them of the saving truths of the gospel would be casting pearls before swine. To attempt to prove the Deity of Christ to persons who consider him an impostor would be absurd: the first step evidently is, to prove that the facts related in the gospels are true, and therefore that Jesus of Nazareth was "a man approved of God by signs and wonders and mighty deeds." If the Holy Spirit blessed this instruction to convince their hearts of sin, as well as their understandings of the truth of the Gospel History, he would then begin to open out to them gradually the hidden treasures of that gospel which they had despised, giving them "line upon line and precept upon precept," until they "knew the way of God in truth." Now suppose this minister's works to be published in two volumes, the first containing the discussions held with these persons while Deists, and the second containing the last instructions they received from him: and suppose a doubt to be raised after his death as to whether he was a Trinitarian or not: to which of these volumes should we appeal? Clearly to the last. And if Trinitarian doctrines were found plainly taught there, what should we think of those who still called him an Unitarian, because there was but little positive proof to the contrary in the first? Why we should think they had some purpose to serve: for it must be evident to any one, that however strong a Trinitarian he might have been, there was not likely to be much proof of it *there*. Yet this is just what Unitarians do with regard to the former part of the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Hebrews. Peter and others, on and after the day of Pentecost, endeavour to reach the consciences of the Jews, by showing them their guilt in rejecting and crucifying Jesus. By the Spirit's blessing the word is carried to their hearts, they join themselves to the Church, and of course receive further instruction from the Apostles; the last of which instruction, that remains on record, being St. Paul's letter to them, commonly called The Epistle to the Hebrews. Now to decide the question whether the Apostles believed the Deity of Christ, which should we appeal

to—Peter's heart-searching calls to repentance addressed to the unbelieving Jews; or Paul's deeply argumentative letter addressed to them long after their conversion, when they were formed into a Christian Church? Some persons would really seem to think the former, if we may judge by the prominence given to them in their endeavours to prove the Apostles Unitarians.

But we must take another case. A Missionary goes out to preach the gospel in some heathen country. On reaching his destination, he collects the people together as best he can, and addresses them. Now let us ask, What will be the subject of his first discourses? Will he begin by teaching them the doctrine of the Trinity, or of the Incarnation, or even of the Atonement? I don't believe any orthodox Missionary in the world would adopt such a course. He would no doubt begin by trying to convince them of their guilt and ruin; he would impress upon them the holiness and power of God, and their own wickedness; he would show them the falsehood of their idolatrous religion, and the impossibility of its affording them either peace in this life or happiness hereafter: in a word he would address himself to their consciences, endeavouring to convince them of sin and make them feel their need of pardon. If there appeared signs of the Spirit's having carried the word with power to any of their hearts, and they began to ask, What shall we do to be saved? he would unfold to them the plan of salvation; but not all at once. He would commence probably by assuring them that the holy and just God, whom they had so grievously offended, was yet a merciful and forgiving God; and then he would lead them on step by step, "as they were able to bear it," feeding them at first with milk, and then with strong meat, until they became fully instructed in "the glorious gospel of the blessed God." Now suppose, after his death, this Missionary's works were published in two volumes; one containing some of his first addresses to the heathen natives, and the other some of his last sermons or letters to them, after they had embraced Christianity, and been gathered out from their heathen neighbours as a Christian Church. Suppose some doubt raised as to whether he had been a believer in the Trinity, and the Deity of Christ: to which of the two volumes would you appeal for proofs of what he really did believe and teach? Why of course to the latter: and if you found those doctrines clearly taught there, you would think it a great want either of candour or of common sense in any one, who should persist in denying that he believed them, because but little mention of them is found in the first volume. Yet this is just what Unitarians do with regard to the latter part of the Acts of the Apostles; which gives an account of the missionary journeys of St. Paul and others amongst the heathen. What can be more unreasonable, than to appeal to these for proofs of what the Apostles believed, when we have by us a number of Epistles written by them long afterwards to

the different Churches, in which the great mystery of godliness is fully declared? We may be reminded that St. Paul tells the elders of Ephesus, that he had "not shunned to declare unto them all the counsel of God." But this was in his last journey, after many of his Epistles had been written; and in the very address, where these words occur, we find a distinct assertion of the Deity of Christ, as will be shown presently. Indeed it would be easy to show, that the very words in which the Apostles from the first announced Jesus, as the Christ, the Saviour, &c. in their full scriptural meaning include every gospel doctrine; which will probably be done before the Lectures close. We shall now proceed, without further delay, to collect the Apostles' testimony to the person of Christ from the whole of the New Testament in order.

Matt. i. 22, 23. "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us." The objections raised against the application of this passage to Christ have been already considered. The Holy Ghost says by the mouth of his Apostles, that it did apply to him; and that would be quite enough for any humble Christian, if the difficulties were multiplied a hundred-fold.

Matt. ii. 4—6. "And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judea: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel";—the prophecy continues—"whose goings forth have been from of old, *from everlasting*." Micah v. 2. The scribes of course were not infallible in their interpretation of Scripture; but any one that denies the application of this prophecy to Christ, will perhaps tell us, who this "everlasting" native of Bethlehem was.

Matt. iv. 13, 16. "And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim; that it might be fulfilled, which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, The land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles: the people which sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up." Now turn to the prophecy in Is. ix. 1, 2, which St. Matthew here quotes. Read a few verses on, and you will find who this "great light" is, that the people were to see—"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be

*no end*, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment, and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this." Mr. Barker says this prophecy refers to Hezekiah; St. Matthew says it refers to Jesus: which are we to follow? Some would say, Neither; we must use our own judgment. Well then exercise it; and tell me, whether there was "no end" of Hezekiah's "government," whether it was established "from henceforth even for ever." See how the words "Mighty God," and "Everlasting Father," must be wrested and tortured, to make them applicable to a mere man; and you will scarcely require St. Matthew's assistance to decide the question. But with those, who do yield to inspired authority, the application of this prophecy to Christ cannot of course admit of a moment's doubt. The Evangelist distinctly asserts, that the two first verses were fulfilled in Jesus; and the next five are a clear unbroken continuation of them: no less than three verses beginning with the word "*For*."

John i. 1—14. "In the beginning was the Word, and the word was with God, and the Word was God," &c. This is a passage on which it is almost unnecessary to say a word; for to any one, who is willing to receive "as a little child" just whatever the Holy Spirit meant to teach us by it, it must be as clear as the noonday sun: while any one who can pretend to say that Christ's Deity is not taught here, shows such a fatal perverseness of mind, such a fixed determination not to believe on any amount of evidence whatever, that all argument with him must be, humanly speaking, utterly hopeless. There has no doubt been much dispute among the learned about the meaning of *Logos*, which is translated "Word": but all that, has nothing to do with the question of Christ's Deity, or with the proof which is here given of it. It really makes little or no matter, as far as our present subject is concerned, how you interpret the word. Whatever you choose to call this *Logos*, John declares, that it was *the God who made all things*, that it was *made flesh*, that it dwelt among them, that they saw it, and that its glory was "the glory of the only begotten of the Father." Observe how plainly we are here taught the very three things, which Unitarians consider so impossible. First, a distinction of persons in the unity of the Godhead—"The Word was *with* God," and the Word *was* God." Secondly, Deity becoming incarnate—"The Word was God," and "the Word was made flesh"; therefore God was made flesh. Thirdly, the same person being both God and the Son of God—"The Word, who was God, and who was made flesh, was also "the only begotten of the Father." In fact these fourteen verses reduce the Unitarian controversy to two simple questions;—Were they written by St. John? And was he an inspired Apostle? The first no one denies; and the second has, I hope, been sufficiently established in a previous Lecture.

John xii. 41. "These things said Esaias, when he saw *his* glory, and spake of *him*." Here St. John declares, that at the time Isaiah spoke the words quoted in the preceding verses, he saw *Christ's* glory. But from Isaiah's own account of it, in the sixth chapter of his prophecy, we learn that he saw "*the King, the Lord of Hosts*"—another proof that the Son was the Jehovah, who spake to patriarchs and prophets of old, and in whom all who trusted were pronounced "blessed." Ps. ii. 12. This truth is also confirmed by—

John xix. 37. "And again another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they have pierced." For on referring to the Scripture, Zech. xii. 10, we find *Jehovah* saying, "They shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for *him*." Observe how "*me*" and "*him*" are used in the same sentence of the same person; which in our lecture on the Trinity we shewed to be quite usual in Scripture.

Acts iii. 14. "But ye denied *the Holy one* and the just, and desired a murderer to be granted unto you." The context, not to say the text, shews very plainly, that it is *Jesus* whom Peter calls "*the Holy one*;" but in Is. xliii. 15, and in numberless other places, we find that to be one of *Jehovah's* names—"I am the Lord, *your Holy one*, the Creator of Israel, your King." If Jesus had meant to *rebuke* the young ruler for calling him "*good*," when he said, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God," Peter would scarcely have ventured to call him "*the Holy one*."

Acts xx. 28. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of *God*, which *he* hath purchased with *his own blood*." Some manuscripts read "the Church of the Lord;" and those, who have studied the subject most deeply, seem to think that the *external* evidence is rather in favour of it. But the internal evidence is most decisive against it; for such an expression as "the Church of the Lord" never occurs once in the whole of the New Testament; while "the Church of God" occurs frequently.

Rom. ix. 5. "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is *over all, God blessed for ever*." An attempt is made to get over this, by translating it "*God be blessed for ever*." This is just as gross an imposition on the unlearned, as the changing of Thomas's confession "My Lord and my God" into "The Lord is my God." The Greek words mean exactly what the words in our English translation mean, and nothing more or less—"who is over all, God blessed for ever."

1 Cor. ii. 8. "For had they known it, they would not have crucified *the Lord of glory*." If "*the Lord of glory*," who was crucified, be not "*the God of glory*" who appeared unto Abraham," it is certainly surprising to find two names so very like one another applied to the Creator and one of his creatures; especially when we read in Acts i. 24, "And they prayed, and

said, Thou Lord which knoweth the hearts of all men, shew whether of these two thou hast chosen." For if Jesus is not to be prayed to, as Mr. Barker contends, they must have addressed *God* when they *prayed* and said "Thou Lord." So that when the Apostles say "Lord" they mean Jehovah; but when they say "the Lord of glory" they only mean a man.—In connection with this we may refer to Ps. xxiv. 10. Surely "the Lord of glory" is, if any thing, rather stronger than "the King of glory," who is there said to be "the Lord of Hosts." Whatever typical allusion may be intended by David to the future entrance of the ark into the temple, no one can doubt for a moment, that its chief reference is to Christ's ascension into heaven.

1 Cor. vi. 20. "For ye are bought with a price; *therefore* glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's." The word "*therefore*" would be quite unmeaning, unless it was *God*, who bought us with a price: but I suppose no one will want texts to prove that *Christ* redeemed or purchased us.

1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt *Christ*, as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents." St. Paul here teaches us, that the Israelites tempted *Christ* on that occasion when they were punished with the fiery serpents. But we read in Deut. vi. 16. "Ye shall not tempt *the Lord your God* as ye tempted *him* in Massah."

1 Cor. xv. 47. "The first man is of the earth, earthy; *the second man is the Lord from heaven.*"

2 Cor. iii. 5, 6. "But our sufficiency is of *God*; *who* also hath made us *able ministers* of the New Testament." With this compare 1 Tim. i. 12. "And I thank *Christ Jesus* our Lord, *who* hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, *putting me into the ministry.*"

2 Cor. v. 20. "Now then we are ambassadors for *Christ*, as though *God* did beseech you by us: we pray you in *Christ's* stead, be ye reconciled unto God." Observe how the words "God" and "Christ" are here used indifferently, to signify the person in whose place St. Paul stood, and in whose name he pleaded.

2 Cor. viii. 9. "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, though he was rich, yet for your sakes he became poor, that ye through his poverty might be rich." Christ tells us himself in what he was rich—"the glory which he had with his Father before the world was."

Gal. i. 12. "For I neither received it of *man*, neither was I taught it, but by the revelation of *Jesus Christ.*"

Gal. iii. 13. "Christ hath *redeemed* us from the curse of the law." To which add, 1 Tim. ii. 6. "Who gave himself a *ransom* for all;" and compare them with Ps. xlix. 7. "None of them (no *man*) can *redeem* his brother, nor give to God a *ransom* for him." Also with Is. xlvii. 4. "As for our *Redeemer*, the Lord of Hosts is his name, the Holy one of Israel."

Nor must we omit the remarkable saying of Job; "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." Job. xix. 25—27. It is quite clear that the Redeemer, who was living *at that time* and who was to *stand* upon the earth, is the *God* whom Job would *see*. How could Job see the invisible Godhead? Why as "manifest in the flesh"—in the person of Jesus Christ the Redeemer.

Eph. iv. 7—9. "But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of *Christ*. Wherefore *he* saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth?" With which compare Ps. lxxviii. 17, 18. "The chariots of *God* are twenty thousand, even thousands of angels: the Lord is among them, as in Sinai, in the holy place. *Thou* hast ascended on high, *thou* hast led captivity captive: *thou* hast received gifts for men." This *God* then, who ascended upon high, &c., St. Paul tells us was *Christ*.

Eph. v. 25—27. "Even as *Christ* also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that *he* might *sanctify* and *cleanse* it with the washing of water by the word, that he might *present it to himself* a glorious Church, not *having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing*." Compare Jude 24, 25. "Now unto him that is able to keep you from falling, and to *present you faultless* before the presence of *his* glory with exceeding joy, to the only wise *God our Saviour*," &c. Observe Paul and Jude both teach in these verses, that it is the same person, who purifies the Church, who presents it, and to whom it is presented: but Paul calls the person *Christ*, while Jude calls him *God our Saviour*.

Phil. ii. 4—8. "Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let this mind be in you that was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." To any one acquainted with the Greek language, (especially if he have studied what has been written on it by learned critics on both sides) perhaps no passage in the whole Bible is more full and satisfactory than this. A whole army of objections must take to flight before one such unquestionable witness. Nor would it be much less convincing to the unlearned reader, were it not for the gross perversions by which Unitarians seek to destroy its meaning. These extraordinary attempts at explaining it (or rather, explaining it away) have been so often refuted and exposed, that it must be quite unnecessary to discuss them

here. I shall therefore only endeavour to show the force of these verses in as intelligible a way as possible to the latter portion of my readers. The first thing to observe is, that St. Paul is here exhorting us to deny ourselves for the sake of others, by the example of Christ. This he puts before us in two points of view; the distinction between which is clearly marked in the original. His self-denying humility is shown—Firstly, in laying aside the glory of his Godhead ~~to become~~ man (v. 6, 7); Secondly, in submitting as man to the death upon the cross (v. 8). Let us then take these in order; and begin by examining, what was that “form of God,” which Jesus *laid aside*, in order that he might *take* “the form of a servant”? Mr. Slade’s remarks on this expression are so very clear, that I cannot do better than quote them.—“Neither Erasmus’s opinion, that the form of God consisted of those sparks of Divinity, by which Christ, during his incarnation, manifested his Godhead; nor the opinion of the Socinians, that it consisted in the power of working miracles, is well founded. For Christ did not lay aside either one or the other, but possessed both, during the whole time of his public ministry. In like manner, the opinion of those, who by “the form of God” understand the Divine *nature* and the government of the world, cannot be admitted; since Christ, when he became man, could not lay aside the nature of God, and, with respect to the government of the world, we are led by what the Apostle tells us in Heb. i. 3, to believe that he did not part even with that, but still upheld all things by the word of his power. Wherefore, the opinion of Whitby and others seems better founded, who by “the form of God” understand the visible glorious light, in which the Deity is said to dwell, 1 Tim. vi. 16, and by which he manifested himself to the patriarchs of old, Deut. v. 22—24, which was commonly accompanied with a numerous retinue of angels, Ps. lxxiii. 17, and which is called the *similitude* of the Lord, Numb. xii. 8, the *face*, Ps. xxxi. 16, the *presence*, Ex. xxxiii. 15, and the *shape*, John v. 37. This interpretation is supported by the term *morphe*\* here used, which signifies a person’s outward shape, or appearance, and not his nature, or essence. Thus Mark xvi. 12. Matt. xvii. 2. This *form* he had with the Father before the world was, John xvii. 5, Heb. i. 3, and he will appear again with it at the last day, Matt. xvi. 27. Lastly, this sense of “the form of God” is confirmed by the sense of “the form of a servant,” which evidently denotes the *appearance* and *behaviour* of a bondman, not that Christ was actually any person’s bondman or slave.”

Having thus shown the pre-existence of Christ as God,† the Apostle goes on to mention his first act of humiliation for

\* The Greek word, which is in the text translated “form.”

† The reason why Paul expresses Christ’s Deity by saying, that he was *in the form* of God, rather than by saying, that he *was* God, is—that he is speaking of what Christ *laid aside*. He did lay aside the form, but not the nature or essence of Deity.



our sakes—he “thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men.” The Greek word for “made himself of no reputation” means literally “he *emptied* himself”; that is, he emptied himself of his equality with God, at least so far as “the form” was concerned. And this he did *by* taking upon him “the form of a servant” and being “made in the likeness of man.” There is no “and” in the 7th verse in the original, which being literally translated is “But emptied himself, *taking* upon him the form of a servant, and *being made* in the likeness of men”: while the 8th verse does begin with “and”, which marks the distinction between the two separate acts of humiliation—his stooping to become man, and his humbling himself to the death upon the cross.

There only remains the much disputed expression—“Thought it not robbery to be equal with God.” All critics seem agreed, that the word *harpagmon*, translated robbery, may either mean—1st, the act of seizing; 2ndly, a thing seized; or 3rdly, a thing *to be* seized; that is, an object of earnest desire, either to *keep* if already possessed, or to *obtain* if not possessed. But although the meaning of the word is certain enough, yet the application of it in the passage before us is by no means so certain. Taken by itself, without reference to its connexion with the rest of the sentence, the passage will bear the three following interpretations. First; he thought not his being equal with God a thing unlawfully seized or stolen: this is the interpretation given of it in our translation. Secondly; he thought not equality with God a thing to be aimed at: this is the Unitarian interpretation of it. Thirdly; he thought not his equality with God an object of such earnest desire as to make him unwilling to give it up. Now the first, although perfectly true, seems to have no force in it; for if Jesus was in the form of God, how *could* he think it any robbery to be equal with God? To say that he thought it not robbery to be equal with God, appears an unnecessarily round-about way of expressing his equality with him, besides destroying the force of the next word “but.” The second, or Unitarian interpretation is in flat contradiction to the whole context. It implies that Jesus had not a natural equality with God, which if he was “in the form of God” he must have had; it leaves him nothing to empty himself of, when taking the form of a servant; and it is no example of self-denial or humility, which is the evident drift of the Apostle’s argument. Only think of a mere *man* being set before us as a pattern of lowliness and consideration for others, because he actually did not aim at being equal with God! The third interpretation however suits the context as exactly as it does the Greek words; which will be best seen by paraphrasing the whole passage: “Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let

this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, and which he displayed in such a wonderful manner by what he did on our behalf. For although he was originally in the form of God, and therefore of course equal with God, yet when our salvation required it, he did not look so much "on his own things" as to make him determined to *keep* his equality with God; *but* he emptied himself of it by taking upon him the form of a servant (instead of the form of God which he had before) and by being made in the likeness of men. *And* his self-denial for our sakes extended even beyond this; for he not only humbled himself to be made in the likeness of man, but when found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself further by submitting unto death, even the death upon the cross. Wherefore God hath highly exalted even that human nature which he had taken upon him, &c. &c." Will it be believed, that the great Unitarian authority, Dr. Carpenter, has the cool assurance to say, that "there is not one expression in this passage, which implies that Jesus possessed a superior nature?" This is a very favourite manœuvre with Unitarian controversialists. We are told in the same easy confident way, as if it were a matter universally allowed and beyond all question, that "there is not one word in the whole Bible" about original sin, or the Trinity, or the Deity of Christ, &c. &c. and when people have been deluded into believing it, they are exhorted not to let their minds be "kept in bondage by an interested priesthood!!" How many of my readers fancy they are shewing their "independence of mind" and "freedom of opinion" by taking on credit such assertions as these!

Col. i. 15—20. "Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist. And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence. For it pleased (the Father\*) that in him should all fulness dwell; and, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven." Christ is here first called, "the image of the invisible God." God, who is in himself invisible, became visible by being "made in the likeness of men;" and therefore that manhood, in which he is manifested, is called his image, figure, shape, or representation.—He is next called, "the firstborn of every creature." He is not called "the first created;" but is distinguished from all *creatures*, by being called "the first *born*." This seems rather against the view so beautifully given in "Kelly's four lectures on Prophecy," p. 40, which would interpret it in the same way as that passage

\* "The Father" is not in the original.

in Rev. iii. 14. "The beginning of the creation of God;" namely, "in reference to the Divine person of the Son, *set up as the Christ, before creation, and in order to creation.*" Another interpretation, which the passage will properly bear, appears more suitable to the word "*first-born,*" as well as to what follows; namely, that he was born *before* every creature; "Who, although in his human nature the image or manifestation of the invisible God, must yet in his Divine nature have been born or begotten before any thing was created; *for by him were all things created.*" But explain it how you will, one thing is certain from the passage,—that Christ is *the Creator of all things.* I know that some would alter the word "created" into "created anew"—that is, spiritually; the only authority for which rests in their own imagination, as is demonstrated in Bishop Pearson's work on the Creed. Any one, who thinks that creating "all things that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers," may possibly only mean introducing a new dispensation, had better consult the above-mentioned author.

Col. ii. 9. "For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." On this I quote Mr. Slade again. "Pierce and others understand no more by this phrase, than by Eph. iii. 19, where believers are said to be "filled with all the fulness of God." But the two passages are not alike. I. There is a remarkable difference in the mode of expression: "The fulness of divinity *residing* in a person" cannot be the same as "a person being filled with the fulness of God" or from God; the latter may denote "all spiritual gifts" for the full establishment of Christ's church, but we cannot understand this of "a resident divinity." II. It is never said of Christians in general, that the fulness of God, or of the Godhead, *resides* in them: it is observable, that the Apostle, in addressing himself to the converts, immediately changes his mode of expression, "and ye are complete (literally filled or made full) in him," as in Eph iii. 19, whence alone it would appear, that the two passages are far from alike. Thus Macknight: "Most Christians, agreeably to the literal import of the word *pleroma*, hold that "the fulness of the Godhead" consisteth in the fulness of perfection and government, which is essential to the Godhead; and that fulness they believe as essential also to Christ as the Son of God. The Socinians, who hold Christ to be only a man, affirm, that Divine perfections were conferred on him as the reward of his sufferings and to fit him for being the head or governor of the body, i.e. of the Church. Yet, how the fulness of the Divine perfections could be communicated to the man Christ Jesus, without his becoming God, it is not easy to conceive."—The word "bodily" is interpreted, and no doubt rightly, by the same author to mean "consubstantially, essentially—united as it were in one body, with the Father and the Spirit."

Col. iii. 4. "When *Christ*, who is *our life*, shall appear." But in Deut. xxx. 20, we read, "That thou mayest love *the Lord thy God*, and that thou mayest obey his voice, and that thou mayest cleave unto him: for *he is thy life*."

Col. iii. 11. "Christ is all, and in all." But the same Apostle writes in 1 Cor. xii. 6. "It is the same *God* which worketh *all in all*"

1 Tim. i. 1. "Paul, an Apostle of Jesus Christ by the commandment of God our Saviour, and Lord Jesus Christ." The force of these last words are entirely destroyed by the comma which is inserted between "Saviour" and "and." As there were no stops in the original, we can generally only be guided by the sense of the passage: but here it is *impossible* to separate "Saviour" and "Lord." The Greek language would absolutely require it to have been either "*the Lord*" or "*our Lord*;" unless the "Saviour" and "Lord" mean one person, in which case the "our" belongs to them both, and therefore need not to be repeated before "Lord." "Our Saviour and Lord" is *one expression*; exactly answering to the more usual form—"our Lord and Saviour." Now read the passage properly, and say what it means—"By the commandment of God, our Saviour and Lord, Jesus Christ." Suppose I was to say, By the commandment of the Queen, our Sovereign and Ruler, Victoria; would not that mean beyond all doubt, that Victoria was the Queen? would any one imagine, that "the Queen our Sovereign" meant one person, and "Ruler Victoria" another? No; if they were two different persons, we should have said "By the commandment of the Queen our Sovereign, and *our* Ruler Victoria," or else "and *the* Ruler Victoria." These remarks also apply to another passage, the meaning of which is unfortunately obscured in our translation, and which therefore we shall next take, though out of its order—namely,

2 Pet i. 1. "Through the righteousness of God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The correct, indeed *the only possible*, translation of this in accordance with the rules of the Greek language, is given in the margin of our reference Bibles.—"Through the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ." The word "our," which in the English version is unaccountably attached to "Saviour," belongs in the original to "God;" and therefore, for the reasons just stated, "our God and Saviour" must be one expression, applying to "Jesus Christ;" the form of expression being precisely the same as that used in v. 11, "our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." A similar instance is

Titus ii. 13. "The glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ;" literally "the great God and Saviour of us." Now if "the great God" had meant one person and "Saviour of us" another, it would have been in Greek "the great God, and *the* Saviour of us": but there being no article "the" before "Saviour" proves that "of us"

belongs both to "the great God" and "Saviour"; so that it must be one expression, meaning "our great God and Saviour." In the first of these three passages then Jesus is called "God our Saviour and Lord," in the second "our God and Saviour," and in the third "our great God and Saviour."

1 Tim. iii 16. "And without controversy great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory." On this Mr. Barker remarks, that the Apostle does not mean to say that the mystery of godliness IS great, but that it WAS great before being revealed. His reasons for thus wresting God's word, are, 1st, That a thing cannot remain in mystery after being revealed, which has been already refuted in Lecture III; and 2ndly, That the particular doctrines here specified are *not* mysterious, but "plain simple natural truths." Any one who "trembled at God's word" would rather have reasoned thus; What I understand by God being manifested in the flesh, &c. is no mystery; but St. Paul says it *is* a great mystery; therefore what I understand by his words cannot be what he meant by them.—But let us see what the Apostle does teach here. There has been much dispute about the word "God"; many many manuscripts having the word "which" instead. But there can scarcely be a doubt that "God" is the genuine word; for, independently of the greater number of manuscripts favouring it,\* the word "which" turns the whole sentence, as a learned writer justly observes, "into little better than nonsense." You must observe, that the words "justified," "seen," &c. are all verbs, to each one of which "God" is the nominative case: so that the sentence is "God was manifest in the flesh, God was justified in the Spirit, God was seen of angels, God was preached unto the gentiles, God was believed on in the world, God was received up into glory." Now even supposing we could admit the Unitarian interpretation of the first clause, and understand it only to mean, that God's character was shown in the conduct of Jesus Christ, what are we to make of the last clause, "God was received up into glory"? The text does not say, that God was manifest in the flesh and that *the man by whom* his character was displayed was received up into glory, but it relates several things concerning *God*; the first of which is, that he was manifest in the flesh, and the last, that he was received up into glory. Of course it was in his manifested or visible bodily state that he was received up into glory; but you must not lose sight of the fact, that "God" and nothing else is the nominative case to "was re-

\* There is an interesting little fact about one important manuscript, the Alexandrine.—It was long thought, that the word "which" had been altered in it to "God," from one stroke being so evidently written with a different kind of ink. But when a microscope was applied to it, the original stroke in the same kind of ink as the rest of the word was discovered very faintly *under* the later stroke. So that in fact it had always been "God"; but part of the word having become a little indistinct, some one had re-touched it afterwards with a different ink; which led to the supposition of its having been altered.

ceived."\* Therefore, as there can be no doubt from the context that the clause refers to the ascension of *Christ*, this is a plain testimony that he is God manifest in the flesh—in other words incarnate Deity. Though of no great importance, it always seems to me that the Apostle's language loses, rather than gains, strength by the addition of "the" which is not in the original; his words being literally—"God was manifested, shown, or rendered visible, in flesh."

Titus i. 3, 4. "But hath in due time manifested his word through preaching, which is committed unto me according to the commandment of *God our Saviour*; to Titus mine own son after the common faith: grace, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and the Lord *Jesus Christ our Saviour*." Every one knows how constantly God is called our Saviour, and how constantly Christ is called our Saviour, in Scripture. This would be striking in itself: but what shall we say on hearing God's repeated declarations "I am the Lord, and *besides me there is no Saviour*." Is. xliii. 11. "A just God and a Saviour, there is none beside me." Is. xlv. 21. "There is no Saviour beside me." Hos. xiii. 4. It may be said that great warriors and statesmen are sometimes called the saviours of their country; but this is merely in a temporal point of view, from the assaults of human foes. To see the full force of this word "Saviour" as a proof of Christ's Deity, it would be worth your while to examine all the passages where it occurs in the New Testament; namely, Luke i. 47. Luke ii. 11. John iv. 42. Acts v. 31. Acts xiii. 23. Eph. v. 23. Phil. iii. 20. 1 Tim. i. 1. 1 Tim. ii. 3. 1 Tim. iv. 10. 2 Tim. i. 10. Tit. i. 3, 4. Tit. ii. 10—13. Tit. iii. 4—6. 2 Pet. i. 1, 11. 2 Pet. ii. 20. 2 Pet. iii. 2, 18. 1 John i. 14. Jude 25.

Heb. i. Throughout this whole chapter, the Deity of Christ is argued and proved by the Apostle; though the exaltation of his *manhood* is also mentioned. To examine it at all fully, would require a lengthened comment. We can only very briefly point out the testimony here borne to the person of Christ. Observe first, the difference made between the "Son" and "the prophets." Jesus was not merely "the Great Prophet;" but was also something essentially and by nature superior to them. Then again both in v. 2 and v. 10, he is expressly declared to have been the *creator* of heaven and earth; and in v. 3, to be the *upholder* or preserver of all things. By calling Christ "the brightness or shining forth of the Father's glory" a learned writer remarks that—"The Apostle designed to teach the Hebrews, or at least to put them in mind, that our Saviour was that person of the Godhead, which appeared

\* An attempt is made, by putting the Greek word *hos* instead of *theos* (God), to render it "He, who was manifest in the flesh, was justified," &c. But in the construction of this sentence, the word *hos* would mean—not "He who" but—"whosoever"; which makes nonsense of it. Besides, if it could be translated "he who", it must mean God, or at least some being of a higher order than man; for what could be more ridiculous than to speak of a *man* being manifested in flesh? How could he be manifested any way else? *Man is flesh*.

so often to their Fathers in glory, or in that glorious light which they called the Shechinah, i. e. the glory wherein God in a peculiar manner dwells. Ex. xvi. 7—10. xxiv. 16, 17. xl. 34, 35." In v. 6 he is shewn to be the object even of angels' worship; and in v. 8, 9 he is twice distinctly addressed as "God." The Unitarians used to turn the expression "Thy throne, O God" into "God is thy throne;" but this was so completely refuted, that even Dr. Carpenter acknowledged it to be untenable. They now contend for a *lower sense* of the word. Precisely the same construction is required in v. 9, of which the proper translation is "Therefore, O God, thy God hath anointed thee."

"Heb. ii. 11. "For which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren." Why if he were *only* man, how *could* he be ashamed to call them brethren? What a wonderful act of condescension, for one man not to be ashamed of calling the rest his brethren!

Heb. ii. 16. "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham." There can be no doubt that the translation given in the margin of our Bibles is the true one—"He taketh not hold of angels (that is, to save them); but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham." In fact this is given as the *reason* why he took man's nature upon him; a doctrine plainly taught us in the verses both before and after this. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the Devil; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage." And then he goes on to shew why the great God took on him flesh and blood, rather than any other form in which he might have manifested himself; namely, because it was *man* he came to save, and he who bore the sins of mankind must be himself a man. "For verily he taketh not hold of the fallen angels, to save them; but he taketh hold of the seed of Abraham. *Wherefore* in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." If this does not teach, that Jesus had a superior nature before he was "made flesh," there can be no meaning in language. He took part of flesh and blood *because* it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren whom he came to save; *that he might be* a merciful, &c. What is this but to say, that if that work had not been undertaken by him he might *not* have been partaker of flesh and blood, he might *not* have been made like unto his brethren. But what else could he be, if he had no superior nature, nor any pre-existence before his birth?—Unitarians object that, as his brethren are not both God and man, he could not have been made in all points like unto them, if he were God and man himself. But the context

shews, that their nature is something which he takes *in addition to his own*, so that this difference is absolutely required by the very passage itself, and the whole scope of the Apostle's argument. Being made in all points like us—means that he had a *complete* human nature; but that human nature may still be united to a complete Divine nature: his being perfect God does not prevent him from being also perfect man. How often do we speak of a picture or statue being made *exactly like* some person! Yet the one is made of painted canvass or marble, the other of flesh and blood.

Heb. iii. 3. "For this man was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house. For every house is builded by some man; but he that built all things is *God*." In a tract published by the British and Foreign Unitarian Association, among a variety of reasons for disbelieving the Deity of Christ is the following: "Because, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, Christ is *compared with Moses* in a manner that would be impious if he were the supreme God. "For this man (Christ) was counted worthy of more glory than Moses, inasmuch, &c. Heb. iii. 3." Perhaps nineteen out of every twenty that read that tract will neither remember *what* the comparison is (*which the quotation just stops short of*) nor take the trouble to look out the reference. They will therefore be fully satisfied, that St. Paul there makes some comparison between Moses and Christ which disproves the Deity of Christ beyond a doubt, and will wonder how people can suffer themselves to be "led blindfold by orthodox creeds and hireling priests." If the remaining one however out of the twenty should turn to the passage, he will perhaps be inclined to think that the comparison would be more impious, if Christ was *not* God. For what is the comparison? Why between *the builder and the builded*, the maker and the made: "This man is counted worthy of more glory than Moses, *inasmuch as he who hath builded the house hath more honour than the house*." Moses is the house; Christ the builder of it. And to compare them thus would be impious if Christ were God!! The Apostle did not seem to think so; for having thus stated Christ to be the builder of Moses he goes on to say that "he who built *all* things is *God*." It does not in the least affect the question what meaning you put upon "built." Explain it as you will, the argument remains thus: If God built *all* things he must have built Moses; but in the verse before Christ is said to be the builder of Moses; therefore Christ is God.

Heb. vii. 1—3. "For this Melchisedec \* \* \* without father, without mother, without descent, having neither *beginning of days* nor end of life, *but made like unto the Son of God*, abideth a priest continually." Whatever difficulty there may be in explaining how these words are to be understood in reference to Melchisedec, one thing they certainly testify—



that the Son of God, of whom Melchisedec is here said to be a type, existed *from eternity*.

Heb. viii. 1. "We have such a high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens." "The expression to sit on the right hand" says Michaelis "is derived from the seat of God in the most holy place over the ark of the covenant, in relation to which only can a right and left hand be ascribed to Him who filleth all things. No mortal dared to venture upon entering the most holy place, except the high priest alone; who, once in every year, not without apprehension of death (for death would be the consequence of the slightest oversight in performing the ceremonies) and with the blood of atonement, entered into this terrible and sacred darkness. To sit down at all in the most holy place would have been a rashness and insult unheard of; but for a person to place his seat close to the Cherubim, at the right hand of the invisible God who dwelt above them, would have been nothing less than *declaring himself God, and requiring to be adored as God*: for every prayer of the Israelites was addressed to the most holy place, and indeed to the Deity who held (symbolically) his invisible throne at the western end of the sanctuary. When therefore Jehovah says to the Lord, the King and Priest of the race of David, 'Sit thou at my right hand,' it is, in the highest sense, the same as saying, 'enjoy with me Divine honour and adoration; be the object of all the religious service of my people.'"

Heb. xii. 25. "For if they escaped not, who refused him, that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape, if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven; *whose voice then shook the earth*; but now he hath promised, saying, Yet once more I shake not the earth only, but also heaven."—"With respect to this verse," writes Dr. P. Smith, "it is observable that the person 'who spake on earth' is the same who 'now speaks from heaven;' for it is immediately added, '*whose voice then shook the earth*.'" The opposition expressed is not between the persons speaking, but between earth and heaven. *Hence it appears that the law was given by the Son of God.* 'It is very clear that the giving of the law is here ascribed to Christ. This manifestly belongs to his Divine nature; and I cannot comprehend how any person whatever, who believes the Gospel of John, can find any difficulty in ascribing to the Divine nature of Christ a participation in the giving of the Law,' (Michaelis). Our blessed Lord is further represented as "*now speaking from heaven*" to Christians generally. This could only be by the agency of inspired men, whose commission to teach and command in the name of Christ was proved by miracles; and those miracles they attributed to him. Thus Christ stands in the very position of power, authority, and action, continually ascribed to Jehovah in the Old Testament, *speaking by his prophets*. This is saying of Christ the greatest thing that can be said."

1 John iii. 5. "And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins." The word "he" must either refer to "the Father" in v. 1 or "God" in v. 2. But in v. 8 we read that "the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the Devil." So that in one verse it is said that God, in another that the Son of God, was manifested to take away our sins, to destroy the works of the Devil. Therefore the Son of God is God.

1 John iii. 16. "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." Although "of God" is not in the original, the context proves that it must apply to God.

1 John v. 20. "And we know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know him that is true, and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. *This is the true God and eternal life.*" If any proof can be required that "*Jesus Christ*" is the true God and eternal life" here mentioned, we may observe that *eternal life* is three times in this very chapter ascribed to the Son as the author of it, v. 11, 12, 13. He is called *life*, John i. 4. v. 26. xiv. 6. xvii. 3, *our life*. Col. iii. 4. "It appears also" says the writer I have quoted before "that Arius confessed himself vanquished in a controversy by Athanasius, who cited this text, as a written demonstration, that Jesus was the true God."

Jude 1. "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James, to them that are sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called." In Heb. ii. 11, we read, that "both *he that sanctifieth* and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them *brethren*, saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren." Here then Christ is our sanctifier; while in the other passage it is "God the Father": an instance of the word "Father" being used, not in reference to the first person of the Trinity, but to God in general as the Universal Father.

Such then is the witness borne by the Apostles to the person of Christ. Let us just sum it up, and add it to what we have already gathered from his own words and actions. They declare that his goings forth have been of old from everlasting, and that he had no beginning of days. They call him—our life—our sanctifier—God with us—the shining forth of his Father's glory—God manifest in flesh—the Jehovah whose glory Isaiah saw—the Jehovah whom the Israelites tempted in the wilderness—the Holy One—the mighty God, the everlasting Father—God blessed for ever—the Lord from heaven—God our Saviour and Lord—our God and Saviour—our great God and Saviour—the true God and eternal life. They tell us he was in the form of God and was equal with God. They represent him as entitled to the worship of men and angels; and repeatedly declare, that he was the Creator of all things; besides in other indirect ways asserting and proving his Godhead. Yet teachers can be found, professing to preach the gospel of Christ, who tell us that the Apostles were all

Unitarians!! And many think it a mark of superior intellect and independence of mind to believe them! One exception however to this at least is on record; and that perhaps the greatest man Unitarians could ever boast of—in this country at least. “One thing I can say,” wrote Coleridge after his conversion from Unitarianism, “that I never falsified Scripture: I always told them Paul and John were no Unitarians.”

Having then obtained Scriptural proof of Christ's Deity beyond all doubt or question to any one who submits with humble reverence to the word of God, we proceed to examine the objections which are raised against this doctrine from certain passages of Scripture. Now although we cannot but consider Unitarians as without excuse for disbelieving in the face of such overwhelming evidence, we are far from contending that their objections are all frivolous, or that there are not real difficulties about the subject. But ought finite minds like ours to deny what God asserts, because there are difficulties connected with it; especially when he plainly tells us that it is a great mystery, which we can now only “know in part”? Rather should we bow with adoring awe, and say with an Apostle—“O the depth.” We have no expectation of being able even “by searching” to “find out” the mysteries of the Godhead, nor to clear up every difficulty in that greatest of all mysteries—God manifest in the flesh. If the concentrated learning and intellect of the whole world were exhausted upon it, it would remain as “unsearchable” and “past finding out” as St. Paul left it,—as much “foolishness” to the “natural man,” as much a “stumbling-block” to Jew and Gentile, as it was in the days of the Apostles. God will ever “take the wise in their own craftiness,” and none but “the meek will he guide in judgment.” “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so Father for so it seemed good in thy sight.” Still it is the duty of Christ's ministers to leave no unnecessary stumbling blocks in the believer's way, but, as far as God may enable them, to be “helpers of your joy.” Let us then turn to these passages of Scripture, which are thought to contradict the plain testimony already brought forward; and by “comparing spiritual things with spiritual” let us see how God's word may best be harmonised.

A very large number of the objections brought against Christ's Deity are drawn from texts, which speak either of his *nature* as *man* or of his *office* as *mediator* between God and man. All these are at once removed by remembering, 1st, That in the unity of the Godhead there are *three persons*; 2nd, That the Son undertook to act a *subordinate* part in the plan of salvation as “mediator between God and man”; 3rd, That in order to carry it out he *emptied himself* of his equality with God, by taking the form of a servant instead of the form of God, and by being made in the likeness of man, Phil. ii.

6, 7; and 4th, That, when he was thus made flesh, he possessed *two complete natures*, Divine and Human, being "perfect God and perfect man." A number of questions and cavils may here be raised, such as, that if Christ had two natures he must have been two Beings,\* &c. &c.; all which have been sufficiently answered in a preceding, and at the commencement of the present, Lecture. Such "imaginations and high things that exalt themselves against the knowledge of God" are neither to be indulged in ourselves, nor argued with in others—they are to be "*cast down*." The four propositions just stated have been already proved from God's word, and you will find them to be keys, one or more of which will unlock at least nine out of every ten *scriptural* arguments that can be brought against the Deity of our Saviour.

Let us begin with that large class of texts, which represent Jesus as sent by God, anointed, ordained, chosen, beloved, &c. Now, it is asked, can the same person be both the sender and the sent, the anointer and the anointed? We reply, that Christ and the Father are not the same *person*; but different persons in the eternal Trinity. We have already shown that an angel or messenger, that is a person *sent*, frequently appeared to Patriarchs and Prophets, both declaring himself to be the Lord of Hosts, and also to be *sent by* the Lord of Hosts. This angel then must have been one person of the Trinity sent by another, and appearing in human form to men. What arguments therefore can be drawn from these passages against the Deity of Jesus? If they be thought to imply an *inferiority* in the person sent or chosen, this will bring them under the second class of texts we shall notice; which refer either to the subordinate *office* undertaken by the Son in the recovery of a lost world, or to the inferior *nature* which he took upon him in order to fulfil that office. By using the word "*subordinate*" we do not mean of course "*less important*;" but that he placed himself in a subordinate relation to the Father, acting as his Servant and Messenger, Mediator between God and man, and for this purpose emptying himself of the form of God. Thus Jesus says, "My Father is greater than I." This shows, says the Unitarian, that he was inferior to the Father. True; but *how came he to be so?* The Apostle tells us—He *emptied himself* of the form of God, and *took upon him* the form of a servant. His original nature was equal with the Father; the nature he took upon himself, as well as the part he bore in the grand design of man's redemption, was inferior to the Father. Again, we are reminded, that Jesus was tempted, increased in wisdom, and died; none of which could be true of God. Certainly not; it was only his *manhood*, his *human nature*, that was tempted by the Devil, and killed by men.† Thus also in *his human nature* he is said to "live by

Is a man two beings, because he has both a body and a soul?

† If it is argued, that in this case it was not "the real and very Christ and in his proper person," who died, but only part of him. Will the objector tell us, first, whether the real and very thieves, who were crucified with Christ, died in their

the Father," to have been made "a little lower than the angels," to be "the first-born among many brethren," to obey God, and to "do the things that please him."

In the following passages, Jesus speaks of himself in his *mediatorial* capacity: "I can do nothing of myself—To sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give—The Father hath given the Son to have life in himself—The Father which dwelleth in me, he doeth the works—I came not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me—As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." So, as our High Priest, he prays for us; and, as a man, he prays for himself. So also the Apostle says that "Christ is God's," and that "the head of Christ is God." In all these cases Jesus is presented to us exactly in the character that was foretold of him, as God's "servant" or "messenger;" and therefore of course in that capacity dependent upon God, and acting a subordinate part under him. But again we ask, *How came he to be "found in" this "fashion?"* The Apostle tells us—He emptied himself of the form of God, and *took upon him* the form of a servant. These remarks will likewise furnish an answer to the difficulties raised about his ascension and exaltation: "I ascend unto my Father and your Father,\* to my God and your God;" "wherefore God also hath highly exalted him." Did he ascend to himself? or was he exalted by himself? His *human nature*† ascended to his Father, and was exalted by his Father, as the reward of his humiliation and

proper persons, or only part of them? Secondly, whether both their souls and bodies died, or only their bodies? If he says that the real and very thieves did die, and yet that it was only their bodies which died—he will have answered his own objection. If my body may die without the soul that is united to it dying, why might not Christ's Manhood die without the Godhead that was united to it dying?

\* It is very remarkable that, although Jesus tells his disciples to say "*our* Father," yet he never uses the expression himself. He says "the Father," "my Father," "your Father," "my Father and your Father," but never "*our* Father." What was this, but to shew that, although God is his Father and our Father, yet the word is not used in the same sense when applied to him, that it is when applied to us. Nor is it less remarkable, that our Lord never prayed *with* his disciples. "As it is said of him, he got up before day, or he went into a solitary place, to pray, that he might be marked as *alone* in prayer. So it is said, he withdrew himself and prayed—he continued all night in prayer—he was alone praying. Nor is he once seen in prayer even with his disciples, though he owned their praying, both teaching them and encouraging them to pray.

Why, then, was this? If he taught and encouraged them to pray, and also prayed himself, why would he not, why did he not, join them in prayer?

This may be the answer; his prayers had a character in them which none others could have had. He was heard "for his piety." (Heb. v.) He needed no mediator, but stood accepted in himself. He pleaded no one's merit—he used no mercy-seat with blood upon it. This was the character of his communion in prayer, but into this there was no entrance for any worshipper but himself. He prayed in a Temple peculiar to himself, erected, as it were, for such a worshipper of the Son of God, who offered prayer at an altar the like of which was not to be seen any where—it had no pattern on the top of the mount. He was a worshipper of a peculiar order, as he was a priest of a peculiar order, or a servant of a peculiar order. He did not owe service, but he learnt it—he did not owe worship, but he rendered it. He was the voluntary servant (Ex. xxi. 5. Heb. v. 8), and the meritorious worshipper. Thus he prayed 'alone.'

† Yet on account of the Divine nature being united to his human nature St. Paul says, that "God was received up into his glory." 1 Tim. iii. 16.

sufferings for our sakes. But the glory and power, which was then conferred on him as man, was only an addition to the glory *which he had with the Father "before the world was;"* "In the beginning was the Word and the Word was *with God*, and the Word *was God*."—Of a similar kind are the following; "That they might know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent"—"And call no man your Father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even Christ"—"To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him"—"There is one God, and one mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus." These passages do not prove that Christ is not one person in the Godhead spoken of; other Scriptures declare that he is: but they mention him in his *distinct* character as *mediator* between God and man. If St. John had only said "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God," Unitarians would have brought it forward as proof that the Word could not *be* God, because, being "with God," it must be something distinct from God: but St. John tells us that, although there was a distinction, yet "the Word *was* God." This supplies us with a principle of interpretation, by which alone such expressions as those just quoted can be harmonised with the positive declarations of Scripture concerning the Deity of Christ.

There seems to be a prejudice in the present day against familiar illustration being applied to sacred subjects—as if it was not treating them with sufficient reverence. But considering that by far the greater part of our Lord's teaching consisted of the most familiar illustration possible, taken from the commonest objects of nature, or the most ordinary events of daily life, we need have no fear in attempting, at however great a distance, to follow his example. A simple illustration will often remove a difficulty more effectually than the most laboured argument: only we must remember that, however striking and forcible it may appear, it must always be more or less imperfect, when Divine things are compared with human. Even in our Lord's parables, if pressed close, the likeness will not hold good in every minute point; so long as the general drift and bearing of it convey the required instruction, its end is gained. Let us then see if we cannot find some earthly similitude, which may assist our faith in receiving this great mystery of godliness—God manifest in flesh.

The first great point, about which so much difficulty is felt, has been already illustrated at the beginning of this lecture. A red-hot cannon-ball possesses two complete natures, fire and iron: and yet is only one thing. Both these natures possess all their original properties entire, except appearance. Whatever may be said of fire, may be said of that ball; and whatever may be said of iron, may be said of that ball. Yet the two

natures remain in another sense perfectly distinct; iron cannot burn, nor can fire batter down a stone wall. So whatever may be said of a man, may be said of Christ; and whatever may be said of God, may be said of Christ. Yet the two natures are in a sense distinct: as God, he knows all things; as man, he only knows what is communicated to him, &c. If the iron could speak, it might say, I cannot burn of myself; it is the fire, which is in me, that burns: just as Jesus says, I can of mine own self do nothing; the Father which dwelleth in me, he doeth the works. This might be carried out further: but we hasten on to the second point, which to many minds is no less difficult, namely, that Christ should be Mediator between God and man, and yet be himself one person in the Triune Godhead. This, say Unitarians, is being Mediator between *himself* and man. Well, what is that, but the same person appearing in two characters, holding two offices, or acting two parts? For instance; I am the patron of a living, and being a clergyman I present myself to it. Here I am both the presenter and the person presented, the giver and the receiver. Who would argue, that I could not be the patron or presenter of the living, because I was the person presented to it? It is quite clear, I present in one character, office, or capacity, and am presented in another.—Again, I let my mind wander, bring it back, fix it on something—Is my mind part of myself? If so; how can that which brings back and that which is brought back, that which fixes and that which is fixed be the same? Further, I obey my conscience, consult my reason, exercise my understanding. Are my conscience, reason, and understanding, part of myself? If so, will the Philosopher, who thinks Christ could not be God because he was sent by God, tell us how the obeyer and the obeyed, the consulter and the consulted, the exerciser and the exercised, can be one and the same?—Again; a man is committed to prison by a judge for contempt of court. He asks the governor of the prison to release him. The governor replies, I have not the power to do so; I can of mine own self do nothing; your liberty is not mine to give; I am not here to do mine own will. Now it is quite clear that the governor *had* the power to release him, and *could* have given him his liberty if he pleased: he only means that he could not do so *consistently with a proper discharge of the office which he held*. He had voluntarily undertaken an office, which required him to act under the instructions, and by the authority, of others. So did the Son of God voluntarily humble himself to act the part of the Father's servant or messenger, when he undertook the office of Mediator between God and man. While holding that office therefore, he can do nothing of himself; but speaks and acts under his Father's authority.

In the last mentioned instance however, there is no connection between the person giving, and the person receiving, the authority; this feature in our Lord's mediatorial office will be

seen better in the following case: A person, for breach of privilege or some other offence, is committed to the Tower by the House of Commons, until he submit to certain conditions; which he is not willing to do. The Commons choose *one of their own members* to act as Mediator between the two parties. He is directed to offer the delinquent terms, and urge him to accept them. Now this person is chosen by the House, appointed by the House, sent by the House, and yet is himself a member of the House. He is a servant and messenger of the House, he acts according to their instructions and under their authority, and yet in himself possesses equal rank, dignity, and authority with any other member whatever. He tells the person to whom he is sent, that he can neither say nor do any thing of himself; that he can only speak as he is taught; that he has no power or authority but what is given him.\* He promises to intercede for him, and pray the House to release him; and tells him that, if he will submit to the conditions offered and follow his directions, he will find that he (the messenger) has done nothing of himself, but that all his proceedings will be recognised by the House as done by their authority. He tells him further that, as the reward of his undertaking this office of Mediator, he will be exalted by the House to a post of peculiar honour and dignity in addition to his own original dignity as one member of the House. He then returns to those who sent him, and says, I have delivered *your* message to the person *you* sent me to; I have followed *your* instructions in all things; I have persuaded the offender to submit to *you* as the *only* authority which has power over him, and to accept the terms offered him by *me* as *your* messenger, &c., &c. How can he use such language as this, when he is himself a member of the House? He speaks thus in his *official* capacity, as Mediator between it and another party. Yet these are just the sort of expressions, which Unitarians bring from Scripture, as proofs that Jesus could not be one person in the adorable Trinity.

Once more; great stress is laid on Christ's words in Mark xiii. 32. "Of that day and that hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father."—Some years ago it came out in evidence before parliament, that in one of the books used for the training of Romish Priests were the following questions and answers.†  
Q. If a person at confession acknowledge to you having committed a certain crime, and you were afterwards asked on

\* Does Jesus say any thing stronger of himself, than what he says of the Holy Ghost; "*He shall not speak of himself, but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak.*" Yet some Unitarians allow that the Holy Ghost is God, only not a distinct person from the Father; and all admit it to be the power or operation of God. The same remark applies to the Holy Ghost descending upon Jesus "*in a bodily shape.*" Is there any more difficulty in the Son of God taking a bodily shape, than in the power or operation of God taking one?

† Den's Theology. Vol. 6. p. 218, in the edition published at Dublin, by B. Coyne, in 1832, and dedicated to Dr. Murray, Romish Archbishop of Dublin.



your oath in a court of justice, whether you knew any thing about it—what should you say? *A.* I do not. *Q.* Would not that be perjury? *A.* No. *Q.* How so? *A.* I sat in the confessional as God; but I was examined in the court of justice as man. As God I knew who had committed the crime: as man I knew nothing about it.—Now this, which is blasphemy in the mouth of a Romish Priest, is nothing but simple truth in the mouth of Jesus Christ; for he is both God and man. His Divine nature knew all things; his human nature increased in wisdom, like any of his brethren, and was of course limited in its knowledge. As Mediator too, the “day and hour” formed no part of his message; he was not commissioned to reveal it to us. As man therefore, it was beyond his actual knowledge; as Mediator, it was beyond his official knowledge.

Some however may be inclined to ask, What was our Lord's object in so repeatedly declaring his real and perfect manhood, and pressing it upon our attention in such a variety of ways? We allow that these declarations may be satisfactorily explained, without rejecting the equally plain declarations of his Deity; but we don't see the necessity for them. Strong assertions of his Godhead were evidently necessary, because from the form in which he appeared, people would be backward to believe it; but surely he need not have taken such pains to convince them that he was a man: it is not likely any one could doubt that. Such reflections may probably pass through the minds of many in the present day, and for this reason; that those who deny Christ's manhood are very few, whilst those who deny his Godhead are increasingly numerous. The proofs of our Lord's manhood are so constantly forced upon us by Unitarians, that we are apt to think there can be no possible danger on the other side of any one asserting him to be only God, and not a man at all. But if we had been as much troubled by the Swedenborgians, and scarcely at all by the Unitarians, we might perhaps have thought just the reverse. Certainly we should never have been tempted to think the proofs of Christ's manhood at all stronger or more numerous than necessary, but should have admired the providence of God in furnishing us with such powerful armour against a dangerous heresy. Even in the face of the present overwhelming amount of evidence, there have always been sects in every period of the Christian Church, who have denied the reality of our Lord's manhood: how much more numerous then in all likelihood would they have been, if Jesus had not made such very strong and positive declarations on the subject. And it is worthy of observation, that *the first heretics* who started up in the Apostle's days, were deniers, *not of the Saviour's Godhead, but of his manhood.* These were the men whom St. John denounces so severely for denying “that Jesus Christ is come *in the flesh.*” What an extraordinary error for any one to fall into, if Jesus was *nothing but a man!* How inconceivable,

that a considerable body of men, in the very time of the Apostles, should believe the Saviour to be *only God*, if there was no proof of his being *God at all*! What ground could they have possibly had to stand on? But take into consideration the Scriptural testimony to the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ, and the mystery is explained. As the Apostles themselves preached the Godhead of Christ, the heretics we speak of would have something to go upon; and with the help of the cavils, now used by Unitarians, about the impossibility of a God-man, they would be able to make out as good a case against the Saviour's Humanity, as was ever made out against his Deity. The truth is a stumbling-block to the natural man; and we are not surprised at his striking his foot against it, on whichever side he may fall.

Another reason why Christ's Manhood is made so prominent in Scripture is a matter of practical importance to ourselves; and with it we will conclude the present subject. It is doubtless to remind us of the privilege of having a Saviour to go to, who, while possessed of all the perfections and attributes of Deity, has also all the feelings and sympathies of man; who having "himself suffered being tempted, is able also to succour them that are tempted." "For my own part," says Mr. Jones, in his lecture on this subject, "I can honestly avow that there is no doctrine in the Book of Inspiration, on which I am accustomed to dwell with more heartfelt gratitude and delight, than that of the humanity of my Lord. Oh! the happiness of believing that as he is very God, so is he very man—that, as in his uncreated Deity he "dwells in light inaccessible, which no man can approach unto, whom no man hath seen, nor can see," so in his humanity he comes down to my comprehension, or at least to my sensibilities and sympathies, and I can think of him as one that dwelt here in a fleshly tabernacle like my own,—as one who was perfected for the mediatorial work by the sufferings which he endured,—as one touched with the feeling of my infirmities, having been in all points tempted like as I am." Let us then endeavour to hold close communion with our sympathising friend above, that we may be able more fully to value his amazing condescension in not being ashamed to call us brethren: and if any difficulties should still appear too hard for us with respect to the two natures being united in his person, let us follow the example of David, who did not "*exercise*" himself "in great matters or in things too high for him," but received them in simple faith, and "*quieted*" himself. Every mountain will fall before us, and every rough place become smooth, when we can say with him, "Yea, my soul is even as a weaned child." Ps. cxxxi. 2.

## LECTURE XIII.

### THE ATONEMENT.

A just God and a Saviour. Isaiah xlv. 21.

"THE character of God is described in holy Scripture by two marvellous words—really marvellous when fully and truly understood. God is LIGHT, and God is LOVE. The government of God is a combination of these. 1. It is the government of a judge; and so viewed, it is light, and in it is no darkness at all. It is righteous, and in it is no unrighteousness at all. It is true, and in it is no falsehood at all. 2. It is the government of a father; and so viewed, it is love, and in it is no anger at all.—The glory of God as a judge is, that every jot and tittle of his law shall be assuredly fulfilled; every penalty incurred shall be assuredly inflicted. The glory of God as a father is, that he passes by iniquity, transgression, and sin; puts forth the secret and gracious energy, which transforms the wandering prodigal into the returning penitent; and receives the penitent into his open bosom of peace and perfect love.—The suffering of Jesus Christ is the moral pivot, on which all this turns. There God proceeds as a judge, pronouncing sentence according to the law, which is holy white light; and there God proceeds as a father, receiving freely to a father's bosom adopted children in everlasting love. This is the combination, by which angels are delighted, devils defeated, sinners saved, and God glorified."\*

Such is the doctrine of the Atonement; "a doctrine," to borrow the words of another great writer, Soame Jenyns, "so constantly and so strongly enforced through every part of the New Testament, that whoever will seriously peruse those writings, and deny that it is there, may, with as much reason and truth, after reading the works of Thucydides and Livy, assert, that in them no mention is made of any facts relative to the histories of Greece and Rome."† Before proceeding to

\* M'c Nells.

† This author is called by Dr. Pys Smith, "A writer of eminence in the polite world, who knew extremely little of theological systems; but who, leaving a careless infidelity, read the Scriptures with attention and good sense, and described the effect produced on his mind by an unbiassed study of the sacred books."—Thucydides, it may be observed, wrote a history of Greece, and Livy a history of Rome.

examine the direct testimony of Scripture on this doctrine, we must first endeavour to remove some stumbling blocks which have been laid in the way, and which unhappily trip up the feet of many enquirers almost before they reach the threshold of the subject. They go to the examination with their minds so full of prejudices, mistakes, and misrepresentations, that the truth is fast barred and bolted out. Let us then clear the way, by considering the chief objections raised against this very essence of the Gospel of Christ.

I. In the first place we are told, that it represents Christ as more kind and merciful than God; that it represents God as requiring something to make him love us; as if Christ by offering himself on the cross produced in the mind of God a feeling of pity and compassion, which he did not feel before.—

This objection can only arise from utter ignorance, or from wilful misrepresentation. For the bible teaches us—not that God loves us, because Christ died for us, but that Christ died for us, because God loved us. “*God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son.*” The sacrifice of Christ did not make God love us, but enabled him to *display* his love towards us, consistently with perfect justice. God “*delighteth in mercy;*” and because he loved, pitied, and determined to shew mercy towards us, he gave His own Son to be a sacrifice for our sins, that the way might be clear for *the exercise* of that mercy, without His truth being broken, His honour sullied, His justice violated, His law trampled on with impunity. God would have been just as willing to pardon sinners without an atonement as with one, if it could have been done consistently with his other attributes—truth, justice, and righteousness. And what proof of God’s love and mercy can the Unitarian produce, at all to be compared with this stupendous display of infinite compassion—the giving up his own Son to die for us guilty rebels? Yet men are found perverse and wicked enough to argue against the Atonement, as if it shewed God to be implacable and unmerciful, feeling no love to us until prevailed upon by Christ, and unwilling to forgive us without a price being paid for the pardon! It’s very true, a price *was* required—*which he paid himself.* And so because he was willing to pay the enormous price which his Holiness required for the pardon and salvation of his enemies, he must be a severe and vindictive Being, whose kindness has to be purchased!! It may be, that the injudicious expressions of some advocates of the Atonement have given a handle to such misrepresentations; but that is no excuse for unbelievers making use of the handle, to raise a prejudice against a plain doctrine of Scripture. Let us remark then at the very outset, (and it is of the utmost importance to keep it in mind during the whole of this subject) that, when we speak of God being reconciled, appeased, pro-

pitiated, &c., by the death of Christ, we do not mean that it produced in him any *change of mind* towards us, but that it enabled him *to act* toward us, and *to treat* us, as a reconciled Father—which otherwise he could not have done, consistently with his Divine perfections. God would have felt the same toward us, whether an atonement had been made or not; but he could not, without one, have given effect to his benevolent intentions; and it was because he felt such love and compassion for us, that he provided a way of salvation, by which sinners might be received into his favour without relaxing the claims of Divine justice.

II. But when driven from this ground, the Unitarian falls back upon another; and denies that it would be any stain upon God's character to pardon a penitent sinner without an atonement; in other words, that truth and justice form no part of God's character, or if they do, that they can *give way* for the exercise of another part of his character—mercy. We reply, 1. No sinner in the Universe ever could have repented, unless Jesus had opened a way of access for him to his offended Maker, and had been "raised up to give repentance." More of this in a future Lecture. 2. This theory destroys all Jehovah's *perfections*; makes him a God of imperfect justice, imperfect mercy, imperfect truth, imperfect holiness, imperfect law. According to this, one attribute cannot be exercised without another having to give way: if justice is exercised, mercy must give way; if mercy is exercised, justice must give way. Whereas, by the sacrifice of Christ, all the Divine attributes are brought into exercise together, without any one of them yielding an iota of its perfection. 3. For the Creator to accept less than perfect obedience to his law would be acknowledging that his law was too strict, that he had required more than he ought to have required of the creature. 4. Reason alone would teach us that repentance of itself cannot blot out past transgressions. A creature is bound to obey God's law perfectly during his whole life. If he did so, he would do no more than just what it was his duty to do. But instead of this, he breaks it for the first half of his life, and then repents and keeps it for the second half. Can his repentance or obedience for the future *do away with* or *make up for* what is past? If he could serve God for the last part of his life *twice as much as he is required to do*, then it might atone for his past deficiencies; but however perfectly he may keep the law now, and however sorry he may be for not having kept it before, he is only just barely performing *his present duty*; repenting and amending his life is only just *what he ought to do now*, and leaves his former debt exactly the same as ever. No doubt God in his word promises forgiveness to the penitent; but then he tells us in the same word *why* he can do so consistently

with truth and justice, namely, because he has provided an atonement for our sins. We are not saying that repentance is of no avail, but that it *would have been* of no avail, if Christ had not satisfied the demands of God's law and borne our punishment. 5. The judgment of man's conscience with regard to the inefficacy of repentance alone to wash away sin is clearly shown by the universal custom of offering sacrifices; of which we shall have to speak presently.

But whether the foregoing remarks be considered as worth any thing or not is of very little consequence; inasmuch as the grand question, which must authoritatively decide the controversy, is—What saith the Scripture? Let us then see what verdict it gives on this particular objection of Unitarians, namely, that there is nothing in the nature or character of God, which stands in the way of his exercising mercy without an atonement.

Ex. xxxiv. 5—7. "And the Lord descended in the cloud, and stood with him there, and proclaimed the name of the Lord. And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed, The Lord, The Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, *and that will by no means clear the guilty*; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and fourth generation." By referring to your Bibles you will see that the words "the guilty" are printed in italics, which shows that they are not in the original Hebrew, but have been supplied by the translators to give what they thought the sense. It is very evident however, that the word "it" is the proper word to supply in this place, referring to what has just been spoken of, namely, "iniquity, transgression, and sin." So that God here proclaims one essential part of his "name" or character to be that he *forgives* sin, but yet will by no means *clear* it—no, not even by means of repentance. Something then does stand in the way of his forgiving the penitent sinner, namely, his determination not to clear sin or let it go unpunished. And how are these two things to be reconciled? How is the sinner to be forgiven, and yet the full penalty of his transgression to be inflicted? By Jesus submitting to the curse of the law for us, and dying "the just for the unjust." This is plainly taught by St. Paul in Rom. iii. 22—26. "For there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just,

and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus"—or in the words of our text, that he might be "a just God and a Saviour." We are here taught that the "sins which are past," that is, sins committed before the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, were remitted or forgiven *on the credit of* that sacrifice; and that the actual shedding of his blood declared or shewed God's *righteousness* in doing so. What is this, but to say that, without such an atonement, he could never have *righteously* pardoned a single sinner; that he could not have been "a just God" and at the same time "a Saviour;" that he could not have been "*just*" and yet "the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus?" For several thousand years it might seem as if God was relaxing his perfect righteousness by pardoning sin without an atonement; but "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth his Son" to be a sacrifice for sin, thus openly declaring his righteousness in "the remission of sins that are past," and shewing how he had all along been a Saviour to his people without giving up one atom of his perfect justice.\* On the cross of Calvary "mercy and truth met together, righteousness and peace kissed each other." Ps. lxxxv. 10. Unitarians deny that mercy and truth, righteousness and peace, were ever at variance; what then is the meaning of their meeting together and kissing one another? Nothing can be plainer than that, when man fell, "truth" required the punishment which had been threatened to be inflicted on him, while "mercy" pleaded for pardon; God had thoughts of "peace" towards him, while his "righteousness" stood in the way. God felt towards him as a father, and yet must act towards him as a judge. How are all these to be reconciled? Scripture tells us—By the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Here every difficulty is removed, and all the Divine attributes displayed in beautiful harmony.†

III. The next objection is, that it would be unjust to make the innocent suffer for the guilty. Now if this be an objection at all, it lies just as much against the Unitarian theory as

\* Mr. Barker wants to make out that "righteousness" here means mercy, and that "just" means merciful. They have as much to do with mercy as they have to do with murder. It is astonishing that eminent writers should have endeavoured to wrest this word in the same way, to get out of what they considered difficulties in certain passages of the New Testament. Donegan gives the meanings of *dikaïos* to be "just, upright, honest, correct, right, good, genuine, fitting, suitable, proper, worthy of, meriting, deserving, equal, even, matching." Nor do I believe that any untheological Greek writer in the world would ever dream of saying that it could possibly mean merciful. If it be said that in Matt. vi. 1, *dikaïosune* is translated "alms"—we reply that it is no such thing. Some Greek manuscripts have *dikaïosune*, which means righteousness; while others have *eleemosune*, which means alms. Our translators have taken the latter.

† "It never was incompatible with God's justice," says Mr. Barker, "to pardon sin when men ceased to commit it. He who asserts that it was so is wise above what is written." What is written we have seen above.

against ours. The Unitarian acknowledges, that Christ did not *deserve* to die, and yet that he *did* die, and *for our benefit*. Why it should be more unjust for Christ to suffer as a sacrifice for us, than as an example to us, I am at a loss to conceive. In both cases the innocent suffers for the guilty; and it is in this that the injustice is supposed to consist. But any such objection is at once removed, by remembering that Jesus was a *willing* sacrifice. "No man taketh my life from me," he said, "but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." And though he proved the reality of his human nature by the shrinking of his flesh from suffering, when he prayed, "Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me," yet he immediately afterwards shewed that all he underwent was purely *voluntary*, by saying, "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently send me more than twelve legions of angels?" If Christ then so loved us as to be willing to die for us, there could be no possible injustice in God permitting him to do so, and accepting his sacrifice as an atonement for our sins.

IV. But how, it may be asked, can one be accepted as a substitute for many millions? Because of the dignity of the sufferer. The union of Deity with his manhood gave an infinite value to his atonement, although it was only the manhood that died. Suppose you wilfully killed an animal belonging to your neighbour; you might probably be imprisoned a few months for it. But suppose you killed the man himself; it would be murder and you would be hung for it. Yet in both cases you only kill a *body*; the man's *soul* still lives after you have killed him. Then what makes the putting one body to death so much greater an offence than putting the other body to death? Why evidently the union of an immortal soul with the man's body gives it a dignity far above that of the beast's. So, (if we venture to follow the Saviour's example in comparing Divine things with human) did Christ's Godhead render the sufferings and death of his manhood an *infinite* atonement.

Having thus, it is hoped, cleared the subject from some of the mistakes and misrepresentations, with which it is often obscured, we may proceed without further delay to consider the different points of view in which this great doctrine is presented to us in Holy Scripture. Let us begin with

### SACRIFICE.

From the earliest times, to which history carries us back, until Jesus Christ appeared on earth, every nation under the sun followed the practise of offering sacrifices to their Gods; and almost, if not quite, every nation, on extreme occasions



offered *human* sacrifices. Their object in doing so, as every one knows, was to propitiate, appease, or render favourable, their supposed deities. "That the Greeks and Romans, and other ancient nations, of whose religion any sufficient notices have descended to us, believed in the *propitiatory* effect of sacrifices, is so familiar a fact to all who are acquainted with ancient authors, that to produce the instances is as unnecessary as it would be almost endless. Herodotus tells us, that the Egyptians believed that the public or private calamities, which might be impending, were avoided by being "turned upon the head" of the sacrificed victim. Some very interesting examples occur in Livy. Horatius, the survivor of the brothers in the combat, was saved by popular applause from the death which he had incurred by killing his sister; but it was thought necessary that his father should provide an *expiation* by sacrifice, at the public expense. When the elder Decius devoted himself to death for the supposed salvation of his country, he was regarded "as sent by heaven to be an expiation to the wrath of the Gods." His son, in another public danger, followed his example, exclaiming that "it was granted to that family to be *expiations* to remove the perils of the state." Were one to go through all the Greek and Roman historians, the instances would swell to a vast collection; and the earlier are the times to which they belong, the more numerous and striking they are. Thus, in the earliest ages of mankind, while the impression of primitive tradition, though so lamentably misapplied, and united with the ferocity of idolatry, were not yet lost by philosophy and civilization,—thus strongly and universally did men recognise, that their crimes insured the vengeance of the higher powers, except it was prevented by the atonement of sacrifices, often highly difficult, costly, and terrific. As amidst the errors of idolatry it is easy to see the effects of the primitive belief and worship of the only God; *so, under this mass of corruption, we plainly see the foundation of original truth.* The idea that man could be saved in no other way than by the *substitution of a victim*, was as universal as the idea itself of a God; and indeed more universal than that of mere prayer; for travellers have discovered tribes, whose worship presented no appearance of prayer in words, but they prayed by action, namely, "by sacrifices." "No one can deny," says Eugenius, who was not a believer in the Atonement, "that in countries so remote from one another, as to preclude all supposition of communication of opinion, the approval of *human sacrifice* has constantly prevailed in the early stages of society. Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, all furnish proofs of the uniform approbation bestowed on deliberate and disinterested murder during the infancy of social life. No explanation can be given of the infernal custom, by

saying it was introduced by those who pretended to hold intercourse with divinities, unless it can be shown that such persons were gainers by its practise. What could priests gain by it, except in nations of cannibals? Neither the Celts, Peruvians, Mexicans, nor the early Greeks were cannibals. So truly meritorious was the practise esteemed, that it was thought *more likely than any thing else to propitiate* the favour of the Deity, at all times when such favour was earnestly desired. The sacrifice of innocence and purity was generally thought to be particularly acceptable among the Greeks. Children, or young virgins, were resigned by their unhappy parents, when it was supposed that the shedding of their blood would be the means of arresting the progress of pestilence, or furthering the progress of cruelty and rapine."

Let us now inquire into the cause of this extraordinary and universal fact. "A plain truth," says Dr. Delany, "which no candid reader will, I believe, contest, is this; that whatever practise is universally followed in the world, for any considerable number of years, must arise either from some dictate of *reason*, or some demand of *nature*, or some principle of *interest*, or some powerful influence or *injunction* of some being of universal authority. Now, that sacrifices were universally practised for many ages over all the regions of the known world, will not be denied by any man, who makes the least pretence to the knowledge of antiquity. That the practise did not arise from any dictate of *reason*, the adversaries of revelation will, I believe, readily own; it being evident that unprejudiced reason never could teach us, that destroying the best of our fruits and creatures could be an office acceptable to God; but quite the contrary. That it did arise from any demand of *nature* is undeniable; for, I believe, no man will say that we have any natural instinct or appetite to gratify, in spilling the blood of an innocent, inoffensive creature upon the earth, or burning his body upon an altar. Nor could there be any temptation from appetite to do this, in those ages when the whole sacrifice was consumed by fire; or when, if it were not, yet men wholly abstained from flesh:—consequently, this practise did not arise from any principle of *interest*, and so there could be no priestcraft in the case.—In after ages, the duty of sacrificing belonged to the father of the family, who was more interested in their well-being than any other person whatsoever, and consequently could have no interest in creating an unnecessary expense.—When fathers grew up into princes, sacrifices were then also at the worshipper's own expense. Offerings of various kinds were the constant practise of private men in their own families; and priests had no perquisites from them." (The author goes on to show the groundlessness of the pretence, that sacrificing was a rite invented by any order

of men, to serve their own purpose at the expense of others.) "Since then sacrifices are demonstrably not the invention of priestcraft, nor the dictate of reason, nor the demand of nature; I should be glad that infidels would so much as attempt to tell us, with any colour of reason and proof, how they came to be practised so universally in the world, *otherwise than from Divine appointment*. How any practise could be followed in the world, to which mankind were neither urged by the interests and craft of any particular set of men, nor by any dictate of reason, nor by any instinct or demand of nature, nor by any interest of any kind; but quite the contrary, *in direct contradiction* to every principle of reason and nature and interest;—I say how such a practise could prevail, and prevail universally, is impossible to be accounted for but from some powerful and irresistible influence of example, or injunction of authority. And what example could have such influence except that of Adam, or what authority could have such power except that of God, is to me utterly inconceivable."—The conclusion then to which we are irresistably led by facts alone, even without the aid of Scripture, is, that sacrifices must have been *originally* a Divine appointment; and when we come to ask, what can have led to such a frightful corruption of the rite of sacrifice as the offering up of *human beings*, there is but one rational answer can be given, namely—that it arose from a vague tradition being preserved of the original promise of a Saviour who should die for the sins of the world. As the families of the earth sank deeper and deeper into idolatry, they still retained some idea of the revealed truth, that "without shedding of blood is no remission," but instead of looking forward in faith to the great sacrifice which was to come, they "changed the truth of God into a lie," and "offered up their sons and their daughters unto devils."

We now turn to Scripture, and see what light it throws on the origin and intention of sacrifice.

The first recorded instance is that of Cain and Abel, Gen. iv. 3—5; "And it came to pass in process of time, that Cain brought of the *fruit of the ground* an offering unto the Lord. And Abel, he also brought of the *firstlings of his flock*, and of the fat thereof. And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering; but unto Cain and his offering had he not respect." On which St. Paul observes, "*By faith* Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain," Heb. xi. 4. From this circumstance alone "it is easy to be demonstrated that sacrifices owed their origin to the *will* and *appointment* of God. The Apostle expressly says, as Moses said before him, that Abel's sacrifice was *acceptable* to God. But it would not have been acceptable, if it had not been of Divine institution; according to that plain, obvious, and eternal maxim of all true

religion, Christian, Mosaic, and natural, "In vain do they worship God, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." If there be any truth in this maxim, Abel would have worshipped God in vain; and God would have had no respect unto his offering, if his sacrificing had been merely a commandment of his father Adam, or an invention of his own. The Divine *acceptance* therefore is a demonstration of a Divine *institution*. If any reader is not yet convinced, I would desire him to say why he does not now offer up a bullock, a sheep, or a pigeon, according to his ability, as a thank-offering to God and a testimony of his gratitude to the Divine goodness, after a recovery from a dangerous disease, after a remarkable deliverance of any other kind, or as an evidence of the just apprehensions which he has of the demerit of sin. The true reason why he will not do it himself is, because he cannot know that God will accept such will-worship, and so he concludes, that he should herein worship God in vain. From hence we may certainly infer that, since Abel did not sacrifice in vain, it was not will-worship, but a Divine appointment."—Abel's faith was shown in his offering an *animal* sacrifice according to God's appointment; Cain's unbelief in offering the more *natural* and *rational* sacrifice of herbs. Cain was the first Unitarian in the world. He thought he could approach God without an atonement, without shedding of blood. He despised God's appointed way—the offering of an animal in sacrifice, and thought himself good enough to offer any thing to the Lord. Whereas Abel had faith in God's promise, submitted to his appointment, and doubtless looked forward through his sacrifice to the great atonement which was at some future time to be made for the sins of the world. In short, Cain trusted in his good works, Abel trusted in the promised Saviour: and this was the reason why one was accepted and the other rejected. How instructive is this story, almost the whole information given us of the world's history for a period of more than a thousand years from the fall to the deluge! In Cain we see the fatal effects of Adam's fall, in begetting a son "after his own (sinful) likeness." Following the natural bent of the carnal mind he is too well satisfied with himself to feel his need of an atonement, although he showed but too clearly that the principle of sin still had dominion over him, and only wanted a suitable temptation to make it break out into any excesses. In Abel we see the effects of converting, regenerating grace, leading him to accept the offered way of salvation, and at the same time to follow after holiness and a close walk with God.

It being evident therefore that Abel's sacrifice was offered up in obedience to a previous command, and that his faith rested on some previous promise, let us see whether we can find any account of them in the inspired narrative.

It is remarkable, that the gospel was preached to Adam after his fall, even before sentence was formally passed upon him. For in the very same words, in which sentence was first passed upon the Devil, was a promise of deliverance vouchsafed to man. "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel." What effect the promise had upon him we are not told; yet surely we may hope and believe, "that he who was the first offender, was also the first monument of saving grace, and that with the promise he received the spirit of the promise, and the consolation of the promise, into his soul. For surely never since, has there been a created being that has stood in such need of a strong consolation. He had breathed the air of Eden, and had been cast out of it,—who has ever made such a shipwreck? He felt himself to be the author of a foul stain on the universe of God. He felt that his act was irretrievable, that he had opened a floodgate, which he could not again shut, and through which a dark tide rolled in, overwhelming all the destinies which had been committed to his keeping. He saw this tide rolling in,—he felt that it was his work, and he could not stop it. Verily he had need of a strong consolation. Whoever but he had his conscience burdened with the ruin of a world,—the murder of an innumerable race of his own children. He knew somewhat of the value of the light of God's countenance,—and he knew somewhat of the horror of its loss,—he had tasted the good and the evil,—and he felt that *his* heart and *his* hand had done the deed which had severed unborn numbers past numbering from the tree of life, and had banished them from pleasant Paradise, their destined place, and had made them outcasts from God, and wanderers through a homeless wilderness. And whereas he had been entrusted by God, for their behoof, with the pearl of eternal life, he had cast it from him, and instead of it had bequeathed to them the bitter cup of sorrow, and death, and a proneness to every crime, and an exposure to every misery. What a blow must Cain's murder have given to his heart, and what a fearful sense must it have given him of the living, and growing, and spreading reality of that curse which he himself had brought upon his offspring; and as his prophetic spirit went down that troubled stream of human life, which was to issue from him, would not each drop lift up in the ear of his conscience an accusing voice against him—and as the various forms of outrage and calamity succeeded each other, would not his heart wither with the thought "this is my work?"

But the gospel was sent to comfort all that mourn,—and surely it comforted this father of mourners. It revealed to him the love of God. "This was the rest wherein his wearied spirit found rest, and this was the refreshing." This love was

the love of him who was, and is, and shall be,—the infinite in power and wisdom; of him who can make darkness light, and crooked things straight: and he had pledged his faithful word that he would undo this evil which had entered into the world. Adam had ruined his race, and dishonoured his God,—earth had no portion, no comfort, for him,—but he looked forward to the day of the Deliverer, and he rejoiced to think that on that day God was to be glorified, and man restored.”

But what can we learn of the plan of Salvation from this first mention of it. We find throughout the whole Bible, that God's method is to reveal things gradually; giving first a general intimation, and then at one time after another making it more and more definite. It would be therefore natural to expect, that this first promise would be very general indeed, And so it is. Yet the main point, *the very centre truth*, of the Gospel, is contained in it, namely—that the Devil should be conquered, and his work undone, *by a man*, and through *suffering*. The figure of a serpent's head being crushed by a man's heel at the very moment while he was biting it with his teeth represents most strikingly the victory which Jesus gained over Satan *by the very means which Satan's malice employed to wound him*. In the eloquent language of Mr. Dalton, “God saw fit to take a beam from Satan's palace for a handle to the axe, with which he hewed down the whole structure. Satan stretched forth his arm to crush the Messiah, and Christ laid hold of that arm to help him to his throne. Satan's strongholds crumbled into dust beneath the discharge of their own artillery.” That “the seed of the woman” meant the Messiah is proved (if proof can be required) from the fact of Abraham being told that this Saviour, through whom “all the families of the earth should be blessed,” was to be born of his son Isaac's family—“In Isaac shall thy seed be called:” on which the Apostle writes, “He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but of one, And to thy seed, *which is Christ*.” Gal. iii. 16. That the Saviour of the world therefore was to *suffer* was clearly revealed in this first mention of him: and a circumstance, which follows immediately afterwards, gives us the strongest ground to conclude, that God at the same time appointed the rite of sacrifice to be a type of the great sacrifice, which was to be offered up as an atonement for the sins of the world. “Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make coats of *skins* and clothed them.” Gen. iii. 21. As man was not given permission to eat animal food until after the deluge (Gen. i. 29 with Gen. ix. 3.) the animals, of whose skins these coats were made, could not have been killed for food: nor is it likely, “that any of the beasts just made in perfection should die so soon, or would naturally die in many years after their creation.” In fact there can be no doubt,

that they were the skins of animals *which had just been sacrificed*. We have here unquestionably the origin of this remarkable and universal practice. Let us then endeavour to ascertain the meaning of it.\*

It would be tedious to enter into the various theories, which have been invented to get rid of the *typical* intention of sacrifices, and which have all been sufficiently refuted by learned men long ago. It is quite evident, both from reason and Scripture, that the slaughter and consuming by fire of innocent animals could not be *in itself* a mode of worship pleasing or acceptable to God; it must therefore have been *an outward sign*, symbol, or emblem, of some truth which God wished to impress upon the hearts of the worshippers—just as Baptism and the Lord's Supper are outward signs, intended to teach us the doctrines of the new birth by the Holy Spirit, and the remission of sins by the blood of Christ; “as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do *shew forth* the Lord's death till he come.” In the earliest ages of the world there was a much stronger necessity than there is now for the use of *types*; by which we mean symbolical actions “*shewing forth*” certain doctrines or prefiguring certain events. For before there was any written language, truths revealed—say, to Adam—would be in great danger of being lost or forgotten in course of successive generations, if only left to be taught from father to son by word of mouth. And besides it would be more difficult (humanly speaking) to preserve in the world a belief in something *to come*, than to preserve a belief in it *after it had occurred*. Therefore as God has seen it necessary now to appoint outward signs or symbols of the grand doctrines of the gospel, it is extremely unlikely that there should not have been something of the same kind in former ages. And such we find to have been the case. Not to mention any of the minuter Jewish ceremonies, all of which had their typical meaning, we find in circumcision a type or figure of the Sanctification of the Spirit, putting away the lusts of the flesh; and in sacrifices a type or figure of the atoning death of Jesus.

This theory, however, Mr. Barker rejects entirely. He says—“They teach that the ancient sacrifices mentioned in Scripture were types of the sacrifice of Christ; or were intended to represent or set forth Christ's future sacrifice to the minds of those who offered them. They teach that almost all the things and persons, and almost all the acts or events, mentioned in the Old Testament history, were types or representations of things

\* The theory, which supposes that St. Paul and others *accommodated* the death of Christ to the existing custom of sacrifices in order to remove the prejudices of the Jews, utterly breaks down; because it does not even attempt to account for the *previous fact*. It still leaves the question, Why were sacrifices *originally* appointed? and this is what we are considering above.

or persons or events under the New Testament dispensation. All this theory of types we reject. We believe it to be the theory of foolish dreamers; and we regard all the reasonings and doctrines grounded upon this theory, as castles built on air." He certainly must have felt the ancient sacrifices to be most awkward things for *his* theory, or he never would have rushed into such a statement as this. His writings show a considerable knowledge of Scripture; but his memory must have failed him here wofully. Let us turn to a few passages. "And he said unto them, With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." Luke xxii. 15, 16. So the passover was a *type* of something, which had to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. Was it a "foolish dreamer" who said this?—Again, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." John iii. 14, 15. Our Lord here teaches us, that the brazen serpent was a *type* of himself.—Again, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas: for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly: so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Matt. xii. 39, 40; in other words, Jonah was in this particular a *type* of Christ.—Again, "I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and are dead. This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread, &c." John vi. 31—51. Jesus here teaches as plainly as possible, that the manna, which the Israelites ate in the wilderness, was a *type* of himself.—Again, "They drank of that spiritual rock, which followed them; and that rock was Christ." I Cor. x. 4. No one but a Romanist, I suppose, could believe that the rock was actually transubstantiated into Christ. Every Protestant would no doubt understand it to mean, that the rock, from which a stream of water came forth and followed the Israelites in their journeys through the wilderness, *represented*, or was a *type* of Christ: just as "This is my body" means "This represents my body;" "All flesh is grass" means "All flesh may be represented by grass" in perishing so quickly, &c., &c. And because the manna and the water were thus *types* of Christ, they are here called "*spiritual* meat" and "*spiritual* drink." Was Paul a "foolish dreamer?"—Again, "These things were done, that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken." John xix. 36. This can only refer to Ex. xii. 46, which commands that not a bone of the *Paschal lamb* should be broken; another proof that the



Passover was a *type* of Christ. Was John a "foolish dreamer"? If so, his brother Paul agrees with him; for he says, "Christ *our Passover* is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v. 7.—Again, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days: which are a *shadow* of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Col. ii 16, 17. "Shadow" here is exactly what we mean by "*type*."—Again, "For the law being a *shadow* of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? Because that the worshippers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a *remembrance* again made of sins every year." Heb. x. 1—3.—Again, "It was necessary that the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these." Heb. ix. 23. So the Levitical ceremonies were "*patterns*" or *types* of heavenly things.—Again, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an *allegory*; for these are the two covenants, &c." Gal. iv. 21—31. The story of Abraham then and his two wives was, according to St. Paul, an allegory or *type* of the two covenants of grace and works.—Again, "But into the second went the High Priest alone once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people; **THE HOLY GHOST THIS SIGNIFYING**, that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing; which was a *figure* for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect as pertaining to the conscience." Heb. ix. 7—9.—Again, "For this Melchisedec, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him; to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Salem, which is, King of peace; without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; *but made like unto the Son of God*, abideth a priest continually." Heb. vii. 1—3. Melchisedec therefore was a *type* of Christ. That Paul and no other was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has been so abundantly proved by learned men, that it would be quite waste of time to say a word on it here. If Paul then was not a "foolish dreamer,"

we learn from this passage, first, that the rites of the ceremonial law were ordained by the Holy Ghost; and secondly, that he intended them to be *figures signifying* Divine truths—in other words, to be **TYPES**.

But what are we to understand by Mr. Barker's ridiculing the theory of types as a theory of foolish dreamers, when we find him, in a public discussion, turning round upon his opponent, and contending that the slaying of the sacrifice "*represented* the death of sin"—in other words, that it *was* a type! Without however wasting any time on this inconsistency (which is scarcely surprising in the mouth of a man, who asserts in print that Calvinism is "worse than the worst form of infidelity," and yet that "a Calvinist may be a Christian, sincere in heart and sound in faith")—any one must see at a glance that, if the sacrifices were intended to represent *sin*, the most *filthy, noxious, or dangerous* animals would have been the fittest emblems: whereas all the animals appointed for sacrifice were such as are remarkable for *cleanliness, utility, and harmlessness*. Could a more unfit thing be conceived to represent sin, than a *lamb without blemish and without spot*? But let us proceed without further delay to see what they *did* represent; that is, what they were types of.

"The nature, form, and circumstances of a sacrifice carried an obvious import upon their very first aspect. The selection, presentation, and immolating of the unoffending animal, the regard paid to its blood, its consumption by fire, the solemn ceremonies which accompanied, and the particular confessions and supplications of the worshipper,—must have powerfully impressed the ideas of sin and guilt, the desert of punishment, the substitution of the innocent, and the pardon of the transgressor. When men were accustomed to symbolical actions, such a significance would be more readily apprehended and more solemnly felt, than under our circumstances and habits. The refinements of advanced society, and the general use of letters, have made us far less sensible to the language of living signs than the ruder children of nature have always been. How much more must the impression on the heart have been increased, when *the first* sacrifice was offered: when the parents of our race, recent from their guilty fall, were abased by the divine rebuke, driven from their blissful seat, and filled with dismay at the threatening of **DEATH**! A threatening piercing through their souls, but of the nature and effects of which they could form none but vague ideas.\* But when, directed

\* "Such a deficiency and obscurity of conception may very well be supposed to have existed in the minds of our first parents, notwithstanding the unquestionable facts that the animate creation, in all previous states of the earth, had been often devoured by other animals; and that the creatures contemporary with Adam were also formed to be the subjects of the law of death. Those first human

by stern authority, to apply some instrument of death to the lamb which, with endearing innocence, had sported around them,—an act of whose effects they as yet knew nothing,—they heard its unexpected cries, they beheld the appalling sight of streaming blood, and struggling agonies, and life's last throes,—they gazed upon the breathless body,—and they were told, **THIS IS DEATH**:—how stricken must they have been with horror such as no description could ever paint! When, further, they had to go through all the other process of the sacrifice, their hands reluctant, and their hearts broken, and all their soul crushed down by the sad consciousness that these horrid things were the fruit of their sin, and yet contained the hope of their deliverance;—who can imagine the extremity of their feelings? Sightings of this kind are shocking to humanity even yet, though custom hath long made them familiar. With what horror then may we imagine they pierced the hearts of our first parents! And how was this horror aggravated, when they considered themselves as the guilty authors of so much cruelty to the beings about them!—And, when the groans and struggles of the dying animals were over, what ghastly and sad sights must the dead eyes and cold carcasses of the creatures yield him, before they were placed upon the altar; and in their ashes after! How dismal a meditation must it be, to consider the beauty and excellence of animated beings, reduced to a handful of dust!—Is it possible to conceive how God could strike the human soul with more sense of misery from guilt, or more abhorrence of the sad cause of that misery, than by this conduct? Such abhorrence of guilt, and such a loathing of life, that, if the mercy of God had not caused some ray of hope to shine through this scene of mortality and misery, it is not to be imagined how Adam and Eve could bear their being: and therefore there seems to be an absolute necessity that, when sacrifices pierced the heart of man with such dread, and detestation of guilt and misery, they should at the same time be seals to some covenant of mercy from God. That God entered into a covenant of mercy

beings might not have continued long enough in the state of sinlessness, to have had opportunities of becoming acquainted with the phenomena of death. Yet our argument is not impaired, it is even strengthened, by admitting that they were more than obscurely aware of what would be the consequences of violating the command of their Maker.

“One may here also offer a remark upon the impropriety of the notion, that the forbidden fruit was an *apple*. By this assumption, profane and infidel jesting has been encouraged. In fact, we cannot know of what species or genus the tree was. It is self-evident that, in order that the command might answer its purpose of being a *test of simple deference to authority*, it must have related to some act or omission which had the appearance of being *in itself* indifferent. If the fruit of the tree was intoxicating, unnaturally exciting, or otherwise pernicious, (as is probable) that would make no difference, unless such properties were made known to the subjects of the precept.”

with man, immediately after the fall, is evident from the sentence passed upon the serpent, in which a covenant of mercy is necessarily implied. And can we doubt that sacrifices were the seal of that covenant? Especially when mercy is so plainly implied in the very nature of the institution, which teaches that, though life be the forfeiture of sin, yet God will in mercy accept another life instead of the offender's."—*Delany*, i. 148—150.

To examine all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish law, which so clearly and positively confirm this doctrine, would require a volume. Any one, who wishes to study the subject, will find it ably treated in "Mudge on the Tabernacle of Moses," and in "Bonar on Leviticus." "Guild's Moses unveiled," is also an interesting work. I shall here content myself with giving another extract from the valuable work, to which I have already shown myself so largely indebted—Dr. Pye Smith's four discourses.

"Let us in imagination view the striking scenery of a patriarchal or a Levitical sacrifice. A victim is selected, the best of the flock or the herd, without blemish or defect. It is brought before the altar of the Lord; its owner lays his hand upon its head; its life's blood flows upon the ground; it is divided, and burned with fire;—while the conscious sinner sees his own desert, and prays,—'Now, O Lord, I have sinned, I have committed iniquity, I have rebelled: thus and thus have I done. But I return in repentance to thy presence; and be this my expiation!'"

"Could it have been difficult to perceive the solemn meaning of this significant action? Or was it possible for a serious and thinking mind to avoid recognising and deeply feeling principles such as these?—That *sin* is an offence against the blessed God, most heinous in its evil nature, aggravated in its inseparable though varying circumstances, and absolutely insufferable before his holy presence:—that the essential righteousness of Jehovah renders it necessary and inevitable that sin should be *punished*:—that *death*, in all its tremendous meaning and extent, is the proper punishment of sin:—that the sinner is totally *unable*, by any powers or resources of his own, to escape the punishment due to his offence:—yet that God is full of *mercy*, and graciously willing to pardon the guilty offender:—that the way of pardon is through the *substitution* and sufferings of a peculiar victim:—and that, on the part of the suitor for pardoning mercy, there must be such a *propriatorship* in the victim, as to create a beneficiary interest; and such a *moral disposition* as cordially acquiesces in the punitive acts of divine justice.

"In this solemn and affecting manner was it declared to ages and generations, that 'God is the righteous Judge, of purer

\* An ancient Jewish form, on sacrificial occasions; in *Outram*, p. 273.

eyes than to behold evil, and who cannot countenance iniquity; that his wrath is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men; that the wages of sin is death; that there is forgiveness with the Lord, and plenteous redemption; but that without the shedding of blood there is no remission.\* Inseparably associated with a sacrifice were the character and function of the person offering it: whom we call the Priest. It were to be wished that our language had a term answering more correctly to the ancient words used for this purpose, and which denoted a *holy person transacting with God on the behalf of others*. In the early times, the father of the family, and by the same reason the head of a clan, performed this duty for himself and on behalf of his dependants. Noah, Abraham, and Jacob were priests to their own households. Afterwards, the extension of the idea of patriarchal authority, and the importance of the office above all others, led it to be combined with the highest social dignity. In the early part of Abraham's life, the king of Salem, in whom we see that the knowledge and worship of the only God were not yet wholly supplanted among the heathen, was Melchisedec, 'the priest of the Most High God.' This combination of the offices took place also in remote periods of the history of idolatrous nations. In some instances by the constitution of the country, and in others by specific appointment, the same individual was both king and priest. The functions of the office included all religious worship and sacred rites; but the principal of them lay in offering solemn sacrifice to the Deity, whether acknowledged in truth or conceived of under false representations. This is plainly stated in the divine prescriptions concerning the priesthood among the Israelites. While the tribe of Levi generally were to perform numerous services, necessary to the public rites of religion, and therefore were priests in the wider sense of the term, it was but one family of that tribe which was permitted to offer sacrifice, the service of highest distinction; it was only 'the seed of Aaron the priest that should come nigh, to present the offerings of the Lord made by fire.' It was also an important part of the priest's duty, and which demonstrates the beneficial character of the office, to give religious instruction, and to determine controversies concerning the meaning and application of the divine law: and it may reasonably be supposed that this instruction, among the worshippers of the true God, and where there was a conscientious regard to his will and authority, would include so much as was understood of the moral intentions of sacrificial observances. When the Levitical priest faithfully answered to the design of his institution, 'the law of truth was in his mouth, and iniquity was

\* Ps. vii. 11. Habak. i. 13. Rom. i. 18; vi. 23. Ps. cxxx. 4, 7. Heb. ix. 22.

not found in his lips; he walked with God in peace and uprightness, and converted many from iniquity: for the priest's lips were bound to keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he was the messenger of Jehovah [the God] of Hosts."

Having thus shown what must have been the meaning of the symbol from its very form and nature, namely to make a typical atonement for sin, we shall now cite a few passages of Scripture to prove that this actually was its meaning, and then go on to show that all these types were fulfilled in the real atonement made by Jesus Christ. "And he shall do with the bullock as he did with the bullock for the sin-offering, so shall he do with this: *and the priest shall make an atonement for them, and it shall be forgiven them*" Lev. iv. 20. "And he shall burn all his fat upon the altar, as the fat of the sacrifice of peace-offerings: *and the priest shall make an atonement for him as concerning his sin, and it shall be forgiven him.*" Lev. iv. 26. If the offering a sacrifice represents the death of sin, as Mr. Barker contends, how could the priest make an atonement for him? The man would then surely make an atonement for himself,—if leaving off sin is atoning for it, *which it must be on this theory*. Again, "And the priest shall burn it upon the altar for a sweet savour unto the Lord: *and the priest shall make an atonement for him, and it shall be forgiven him.*" Lev. iv. 31. "For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar *to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.*" Lev. xvii. 11. "And Aaron shall make an atonement upon the horns of it once in a year *with the blood of the sin offering of atonements.*" Ex. xxx. 10. See also Lev. v. 6, vi. 7, xii. 8, xiv. 18, ix. 7, xvi. 10—17—34, &c., &c.

Such was the *typical* intention of the sacrifices or offerings for sin. That these types were fulfilled in the person and work of our Saviour, will be seen from the following testimonies of Holy Writ.

"When thou shalt make his soul *an offering for sin*, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands," Is. liii. 10.—"Christ our *Passover* is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. v. 7.—"And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath *given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.*" Eph. v. 2.—"Behold the *Lamb of God*, which taketh away the sins of the world." John i. 29. Jesus is evidently called "the Lamb of God," because he really made that atonement which was *typified* by the death of the lambs sacrificed under the Jewish law. The Unitarian would tell us, that "taking away the sins of the world," only means teaching

us to forsake sin. Was the sacrifice of lambs meant to teach the Jews to forsake sins? No; we are told over and over again, in the texts already quoted, that it was to make an atonement *for* their sins.—“Forasmuch as ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, *as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.*” 1 Pet. i. 19.

These are some of the incidental allusions made by the sacred writers to the Levitical sacrifices. In Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews we have the subject fully argued out; and so positive are the Apostle's statements, that any moderately intelligent person, who can understand, and is candid enough to admit, the plain meaning of words, must inevitably be compelled by a careful study of this Epistle, either to acknowledge the doctrine of Atonement, or to deny the inspiration of the writer. The latter alternative alas! is that too often chosen. The only difficulty here is to make a selection of passages; inasmuch as six whole chapters, from the fifth to the tenth, are devoted to this subject. In ch. v. l. 5, we read “For every high-priest taken from among men is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, *that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin*; \* \* \* \* *so also Christ glorified not himself to be made a high-priest; but he that said unto him, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee.*”—Again, in ch. vii. 26, 27, “For such a high-priest became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high-priests, *to offer up sacrifice*, first for his own sins, and then *for the sins of the people*; *for this he did once, when he offered up himself.*” Here are two points mentioned, in which Jesus excelled the Jewish High Priests; first that he had not to offer up sacrifice *daily*,—inasmuch as his offering was a *real* atonement, while theirs was only a *typical* or symbolical one intended to impress certain truths upon their minds; and secondly, that he had not to offer sacrifice *for his own sins*, inasmuch as he was holy, harmless, undefiled.—Again, “For every high-priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore it is of necessity that this man have somewhat also to offer.” Ch. viii. 3.—Again, “But Christ being come an high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building, neither by the blood of goats and calves, but *by his own blood* he entered in once into the holy place, *having obtained eternal redemption for us.* For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered

himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Ch. ix. 11. 14. Again; "And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and *without shedding of blood is no remission*. It was therefore necessary that the *patterns* of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but *the heavenly things themselves* with *better sacrifices* than these. For *Christ* is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the *figures* of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself *often*, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place *every year* with blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared *to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself*. And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment: *so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many*; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time *without sin* unto Salvation." Ch. ix, 22. 28.\*

Some expressions in the above passage will be commented on by and by: all we have to do with them at present is to prove, that the sacrifices of the Levitical law were types of Christ; and in this point of view they require no comment. Let us then go on to the 10th chapter of this same Epistle, and cite a few more texts to the same purpose. "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins. Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: in burnt-offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, *Lo I come* (in the volume of the book it is written of me) to do thy will, O God. Above, when he said, sacrifice and offering and burnt-offerings and offering for sin thou wouldest not, neither hadst pleasure therein; (which are offered by the law;) then said he, *Lo, I come* to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By the which will we are sanctified *through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all*. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man, *after he had offered one sacrifice for sins* for ever, sat down on the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool. For *by one offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Heb. x. 4—14. On this Dr. Pye Smith observes, "The language of rejection applied to the legal offerings can be understood only as a strong denial of any *intrinsic* value or efficacy in them; for

\* No wonder that Dr. Priestly, disbelieving the Atonement, should say, "This part of the Epistle is not particularly edifying to us."



the command to offer those sacrifices was unquestionably binding upon the Hebrew nation, so long as the Levitical covenant continued in force. The leading idea in this distinguished passage manifestly is, that the Messiah should supersede all the sacrificial observances, by actually performing *that very requisite*, that good pleasure of Jehovah, which they were totally unable to accomplish. Now their known and avowed intention was 'to make an atonement before the Lord, for the soul that had sinned, that it might be forgiven him for all that he had done. The blood I have given to you, (to be offered) upon the altar, to make atonement for your sins; because it is the blood which maketh atonement for the soul.' But to this point they could never attain. And therefore, *considered separately from their declarative intention*, He that commanded them, had no delight in them. This therefore must have been the object in which the Divine complacency rested; this the grand purpose, for which, in due time, the Messiah shall be manifested;—'to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.'"

This application of the Psalmist's prophecy by St. Paul, together with Prov. xv. 8. "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord," will serve to explain those numerous passages, in which God either expresses his abhorrence of sacrifices, or declares them to be worthless. Mr. Barker lays great stress on these, in order to prove that God only "allowed" sacrifices, but never "approved," "regarded," or "respected" them. His theory is, that "God wanted them rather to be content with the simple moral law," but that, finding them determined to have sacrifices, he permitted it, to prevent worse practices. No doubt if the Israelites had *perfectly* kept the moral law, they would have required no sacrifice; and if *we* could perfectly keep it, *we* should require no Saviour. But the Israelites "were by nature the children of wrath, even as others;" and therefore, through the weakness of their fallen nature, the law could not give life. "For if there had been a law given, which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded *all under sin*, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Gal. iii. 21, 22. If Mr. Barker only means, that the sacrifices were of no value *in themselves*, we perfectly agree with him; but that rather *strengthens* our argument: for why should the Israelites have been so strictly commanded, on pain in some cases even of death, to offer up these worthless sacrifices, unless there was some *typical* or *spiritual* meaning in them? Mr. Barker however reduces the whole argument, as far as he is concerned, to a very narrow compass, by acknowledging that they *were* meant to represent something—namely, the death of sin; so that when he contends that God had no respect for them, he

can only mean that they were of no value *in themselves*. He cannot mean that God had no respect to *what was represented by them*. In principle then his view of sacrifice agrees with that of all orthodox Divines; both holding it to be of no value in itself, but to represent something that *was* of value. The only question is, *What* did it represent? Mr. Barker's theory, that it was the death of sin, is contradicted both by the nature of the thing itself, the ceremonies connected with it, the declared intention of it "to make atonement for" the worshipper, and the numberless assertions of the New Testament writers, that it was intended to represent or typify the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.

It is evident therefore, that no one could offer a sacrifice to God acceptably, unless he understood something of its spiritual meaning, and so offered it as an acknowledgement of his need of a Saviour, and a profession of his faith on the Saviour who was promised. To impress this upon the minds of the Jews was the object of those texts, which declared sacrifices to be of no value in themselves; such as that just quoted from Ps. xl. 6, 7. The other texts, which express God's *abhorrence* of them, are explained by Prov. xv. 8. "*The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord.*" They were intended to teach the Israelites, that unless the sacrifice was offered with true repentance and a sincere desire to obey God, it was mere hypocrisy: just as we are taught, that a profession of repentance and faith is utterly worthless, unless they are shewn to be genuine, by bringing forth the fruits of a holy life. Exactly on the same principle that God often declares his rejection of the Jewish *sacrifices*, does he also declare his rejection, not only of the fasts and festivals *which he had himself appointed*, but even of their *prayers*. Is. i. 15.

Mr. Barker lays stress upon a passage in Jer. vii. 22, 23. "I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying, Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and ye shall be my people; and walk ye in all the ways that I have commanded you, that it may be well with you." If he supposes from this, that sacrifices were not used, or at least appointed and accepted by God, until after the Israelites had left Egypt, plain facts contradict him. For—not to mention the sacrifices offered up by Abel, Noah, Abraham, and Jacob,—the very first command, which Moses received from God, was, that he should go to Pharaoh and say unto him, "Let us go, we beseech thee, three days' journey into the wilderness, that we may *sacrifice* to the Lord our God." Ex. iii. 18. There can be no doubt what kind of sacrifice was here meant—that it was not a mere figurative expression for "the sacrifice of praise

of thanksgiving"—by the words of Moses shortly afterwards, "Thou must *give us also sacrifices and burnt-offerings*, that we may sacrifice unto the Lord our God. Our *cattle* also shall go with us; there shall not an hoof be left behind; for *thereof* must we take to serve the Lord our God." Ex. x. 25, 26. This, observe, was some months before the giving of the Law, with which Mr. Barker says God "wanted them to be content." And not only so; but on the very night they left Egypt they were all commanded to slay a lamb, to sprinkle the blood on their doors, and to eat the flesh, with certain specified ceremonies. Any one, who neglected this, was to be cut down by the destroying angel, when he slew all the first-born of the Egyptians; "the Holy Ghost this signifying"—that all professing Christians, to whose hearts the atoning blood of the Lamb has not been applied, and who do not feed upon him by a living faith, will fall in one common destruction with the open enemies of God: "*Christ our passover is sacrificed for us*; therefore let us keep the feast." This ordinance was called by God himself "*the sacrifice of the Lord's passover*," and was commanded to be observed "throughout their generations." It is quite clear therefore, that Jeremiah's expression *cannot* be taken literally; nor is there any necessity; for every one acquainted with scripture language knows, that it is a very common way of *comparing* two things together. For instance; "So now it was *not you* that sent me hither, *but God*." Gen. xlv. 8. Joseph of course did not mean, that his brethren had *not* sent him there, for it was very plain they *had*; but that *God's* sending him there *was the chief point to be attended to*. Again; "Let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth." 1 John iii. 8. St. John cannot mean, that we are *not* to love in word; what he does mean is clearly this,—that it is no use loving in word, *unless we also* love in deed. So no doubt Jer. viii. 22 is intended to teach the lesson taught in so many other passages of scripture,—that the mere offering of sacrifices was useless, unless it was accompanied with certain dispositions of heart; that the performance of religious duties, without practical godliness, is a mockery of God: "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams."

One more circumstance connected with the Jewish ritual yet remains to be noticed. In order to weaken the force of the argument from sacrifice, we are reminded that atonement was sometimes made with *incense*, which simply represented prayer or intercession. Numb. xvi. 46. This is no doubt quite true so far as it goes, and may seem at first sight inconsistent with what St. Paul declares to have been the grand lesson taught by the ceremonial law,—"*without shedding of blood is no remission*." But when we examine further into the matter, it becomes a very striking confirmation of that great truth. For the Priest was strictly enjoined, whenever he burnt incense before the Lord, always to light it from the fire which was kept burning on the brazen altar of *sacrifice*.

Lev. xvi. 11—14. And to show the importance of this ceremony, Nadab and Abihu were struck dead upon the spot, for daring to offer "strange fire;" that is, for lighting their incense with fire which was not taken from the brazen altar. The Israelites were hereby taught two things. First, that their prayers could only be offered acceptably *through a Mediator*, as they were not allowed to offer incense of themselves, but could only do it through the Priest: and secondly, that a Mediator, who could effectually intercede for them; must first have made an atonement for their sins. The sacred writers, when speaking of Christ's intercession for us, almost invariably thus connect it with his atonement. In 1s. liii. 12. we read "*He bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.*" In Heb. ix. 25—27, the Apostle closely connects our Lord's being "able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to *make intercession* for them,"\* with his having an "unchangeable priesthood," and being "such an high priest" as could make a perfect atonement for the sins of the world by offering up himself. In the same way writes St. John, "If any man sin, we have an *advocate* with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the *propitiation* (or atonement) for our sins." 1 John ii. 1. In fact our Saviour's atoning blood is the only ground, on which he can advocate our cause or intercede for us with our offended Father. He can say nothing good of us; he cannot excuse or palliate our sin: no, all he can plead is the glorious work which he himself accomplished on the cross. Our great High Priest lights his incense from the fire on the altar of sacrifice, and then God is "faithful and just" to his covenant with the only begotten Son, and "forgives us our sins."

Dear brethren, are any of you offering "strange fire" unto the Lord? Are you thinking, that God will hear your prayers, though they be not presented through the great High Priest, in reliance on his atoning blood? Oh! remember Nadab and Abihu. Your presumption is no less than theirs, and will assuredly in the end meet with the same doom. "Whatsoever ye shall ask *in my name*," said Jesus, "I will do it." How can you ask any thing in his name, when you deny the efficacy of his blood, and renounce all trust in his merits or intercession?

### RECONCILIATION.

It may have escaped the observation of those, who have been happy enough to keep clear of the stormy regions of controversy, that when this word "reconciliation" is used by

\* We are referred by those who deny the intercession of Christ to Rom. viii. 26, where the Spirit is said to intercede for us. But the difference between the two cases is plainly marked by the Apostle. The Spirit is represented as interceding for us, by *assisting* our prayers; Christ is represented as interceding for us, by *presenting* our prayers with his own, in his capacity of High Priest. If Christ only assists our prayers, what connection could there be between his intercession and his Priesthood? The High Priest did not teach or assist the people to offer incense, he offered it *for them*.

the writers of the New Testament, they never speak of Christ's death reconciling God to us, but always of its reconciling us to God; which at first sight seems evidently to favour the Unitarian theory respecting the object of our Saviour's death, namely, that it was not to atone for our sins, but to produce a moral effect upon our minds. But supposing the word "reconciliation" always did mean the removal of our enmity to God, and nothing else—it would only prove that this was *one* object of Christ's death (which nobody denies); it would not prove that there was not another object in it as well, expressed in the words "atonement," "propitiation," &c., &c. If one inspired apostle plainly states that Jesus died to propitiate God towards us, and another as plainly says that he died to change our enmity against him into love—what are we to learn? why of course that the object of his death was to effect *both*. But although we fully allow this truth, it so happens that the word "reconcile," when it comes to be examined, does *not* in scripture language always mean what the Unitarians assert. To reconcile one party to another means simply to *effect a reconciliation between them*; that is, to remove whatever had separated them, *without at all implying on which side the cause of separation lay*. This is put beyond all doubt by 1 Sam. xxix. 4. The story is this: David, to escape the wrath of his master Saul, had taken refuge with the Philistines. While there, war breaks out between Saul and the Philistines. David offers to go out with the Philistines to battle against his former master. The Philistine chiefs, however, suspect his sincerity; being afraid lest in the midst of the battle he should turn round and fight against them, in order to propitiate, appease, or regain the favour of, his offended master: and they express themselves in these words, "Let him not go down with us to battle, lest in the battle he be an adversary to us: for wherewith should he *reconcile himself unto his master*? should it not be with the heads of these men?" Now according to the Unitarian theory, they ought to have said, "wherewith shall he reconcile *his master unto himself*?" for Saul was the offended party. David did not want reconciling to Saul, in the Unitarian sense of the words, for he had no enmity against him; but he wanted Saul to be reconciled to him: and the Philistines thought that, by cutting off their heads and presenting them to Saul, he would try to *effect a reconciliation*, to remove what stood in the way of their agreement—which in this case happened to be the anger of Saul.

When therefore the Apostles say that Christ reconciled us to God, nothing more can be proved from the *words*, than that he effected a reconciliation *between us*, that is, that he did away with whatever had separated or estranged us.\* What

\* Archbishop Magee goes further than this; and contends, in note xx. of his learned work on the Atonement, that the writers of the New Testament being Jews naturally used the Greek word in their own *Hebrew* sense; in which language the expression "to reconcile man to God" would necessarily mean "to appease or propitiate God, so as to open a way of reconciliation for man."

that was, we have already shewn: First, The perfection of God's attributes, justice, truth, and holiness, which demanded the death of the sinner; and secondly, The enmity of the carnal mind against God. We must carefully observe however, that God did not require any thing to make him *feel* reconciled to us; but he required something to enable him to *act towards us as* a reconciled Father, consistently with his perfect righteousness: and because he felt such love to us, he provided an atonement, which should remove the double hindrance to our meeting together in peace, and thus effect a reconciliation. This is clearly pointed out in 2 Cor. v. 18—21, "And all things are of God," the whole work of redemption had its *origin* in the love and mercy of God, "who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation; to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them; and hath committed unto us the ministry of reconciliation." Here is the first part of our reconciliation effected, the hindrance is removed as far as God's righteousness is concerned. On the strength of this, the Apostle entreats us to lay aside our enmity against God. "Now then," now that every barrier is removed, and you have free access to your offended but reconciled Father, "we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." In both cases, observe, St. Paul speaks of *our being reconciled to God*, and yet nothing can be plainer than that he used the words in two very different senses. In the beginning of the sentence he speaks of something, which *God in Christ has done*; at the end of it he speaks of something which *we are to do*. And to prevent any doubt as to what part of the reconciliation God in Christ had already effected, he adds in explanation "not imputing their trespasses unto them." If it be asked, how the death of Christ caused the sinner's trespasses not to be imputed to him—the Apostle tells us in the next verse (which will be noticed presently under another head), that it was because of their being imputed to, or laid upon, Christ, "For he hath made him, who knew no sin, *to be sin for us*; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him."

In all other places where this word occurs with reference to the work of Christ, it is in the original "propitiate" or "propitiation," excepting Rom. v. 10, 11, (where the word "atonement" is in the original "reconciliation.") Eph. ii. 16, and Col. i. 20—22: In each of which I believe the atonement to be the *prominent* idea; but as they will readily allow of an argument, and the question has been already shewn to be one of no vital importance, we shall pass on to another term, which will neither admit of a doubt nor a double meaning, namely—

#### PROPTIATION OR ATONEMENT.

We put these two together, not only because they mean the same thing, but because they are in the original *the very*

*same word.* The Old Testament, as you are aware, was written in Hebrew, and the New Testament in Greek. But some centuries before our Lord's time the Old Testament was translated into Greek, which translation is called the Septuagint. As this translation was made by Jews, while the Hebrew language was spoken, and was received by the Jewish nation, there can be no doubt of its being on the whole a correct translation; besides which, both our Lord and his Apostles so frequently make their quotations from it instead of from the Hebrew, that it comes to us with almost equal authority. By means of the Septuagint therefore, we are able to compare the language of the Old and New Testaments together, both being in Greek. Now in every instance I believe throughout the whole Bible, where the words "propitiation," "atonement," or "reconciliation" occur, (with the exception of those mentioned under our last head, together with Matt. v. 24, 1 Cor. vii. 11, and Rom. xi. 15,) the Greek word is precisely the same, and its meaning so plain, that there can be no dispute about it. It would be waste of time to refer you to the numerous places in the Old Testament, where it is applied to the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Levitical law, as their typical meaning has been already shewn. We shall therefore only mention those passages of the New Testament, in which it is directly applied to the Saviour.

Rom. iii. 25. "Whom God hath set forth *to be a propitiation* (or *atonement*) through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God." A propitiation is any thing which propitiates a person, that is, which makes him propitious or favourable. But the same remark must be repeated here, which has been made before; namely, that we are not to suppose the sacrifice of Christ made God favourably *disposed* towards us, but that it enabled him to *act* favourably towards us consistently with the perfection of his attributes. It was because God was so propitious or favourable to us, that he gave his only begotten Son to be a sacrifice for our sins. This is mentioned in 1 John iv. 10, as the great proof of God's love to us; "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the *propitiation* for our sins." The death of Christ "declared his *righteousness*" in remitting sins and *receiving us into his favour*; and thus he was "set forth to be a *propitiation*." Mr. Barker's theory is (and I know no other way of escaping from the doctrine of the Atonement) that Christ was our propitiation by teaching us to propitiate God ourselves, that is, to repent and forsake sin. What sense this will make of the text I leave you to judge.

Heb. ii. 17. "Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation (*propitiation* or *atonement*) for the sins of the people." If an attempt to get out of the plain declaration, that Christ made a propitiation *for* our sins, by saying, that

he taught us to forsake them, is not "wresting" scripture, I should be glad to know what is. But the Apostle John seems to be especially directed by the Holy Spirit to meet this cavil; for he says, "My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. *And if any man sin*, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is *the propitiation for our sins*; and not for ours only; but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John. ii. 1, 2. According to Mr. Barker's theory, Christ would be our propitiation, if from the effects of his teaching and example we did *not* sin; but St. John says that he is our propitiation, if we *do* sin. Of course he does not mean that we shall be saved by Christ's death, if we continue in wilful habitual sin; indeed he expressly says, "These things write I unto you, that ye sin not:" but knowing how weak and prone to fall we are at the best, he goes on to say "And if any man sin," if his conscience accuses him of short-comings, infirmities, and imperfections, if with all his endeavours after holiness he still finds himself falling far short of the perfect law of God,—he need not despair, for "we have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins."

It was for this purpose therefore,—namely, to harmonise the Divine attributes of justice and mercy, and thus enable God to receive the penitent sinner into his favour with perfect righteousness—that Jesus Christ

### BARE OUR SINS, and DIED FOR US.

This doctrine of *substitution*, (besides being the essential idea, as has been already shewn, of Jesus being made a *sacrifice* or *offering* for our sins,) is also set forth amongst others, in the following passages of scripture.

Is. lii. 13—15, and ch. liii. I think I shall be doing a great service to my readers, by giving them an improved translation of these verses from the pen of Dr. Pye Smith. For although the authorized version is so plain, that nothing but wilful blindness could "err therein," yet the force of one or two particular expressions is not fully shown in it. Isaiah lii. 13. "Behold, my servant shall be successful: he shall be exalted, and extolled, and be very high. 14. Though many are struck with astonishment at thee; his appearance is disfigured more than that of any man, and his form more than that of any of the children of men: 15. yet shall he consecrate many nations: kings shall keep silence before him; for what had not been related to them they shall see, and what they had not heard they shall understand.—liii. 1. (—Who believeth our declaration? And to whom is the arm of Jehovah revealed?—) 2. Yet he shall spring up as a tender shoot before them [*i. e.* the Jewish people,] and as a root out of dry ground; he has no form nor beauty, that we should gaze at him; no appearance, that we should be delighted with him: 3. despised and neglected by men, a man of sorrows and familiar with suffer-



ings, and like one who hideth his face from us [to bury his griefs in seclusion;] disdained; and we gave him no attention. 4. Surely, our sufferings he beareth, and our pains he supporteth. But we deemed him stricken, smitten by God, and devoted to affliction. 5. Yet he is pierced for our transgressions, crushed for our iniquities: the chastisement of our reconciliation is upon him, and by his bloody stripes we have healing. 6. All we like sheep have gone astray, each to his own way have we turned, and Jehovah causeth to fall upon him the iniquity of us all. It is exacted, and he answereth to it and openeth not his mouth: [in any complaint, *i. e.* he entirely acquiesces in being held responsible:] he is led forth as a lamb to slaughter, and, as a sheep before her shearers is silent, so he openeth not his mouth. 8. From custody and from sentence he is taken away; but who of his generation attendeth to it? Since he is cut off out of the land of the living; from the transgression of my people the stroke is upon them, [*i. e.*, the divine judgment upon his persecutors and murderers.] A grave is assigned him with the wicked; but his tomb is a rich man's: for he hath done no injustice, and no guile is in his mouth.

10. But Jehovah is pleased to crush him with sufferings!

If he will offer himself a sacrifice for sin, he shall see his posterity, he shall prolong his days, and the gracious purpose of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. 11. The effects of his soul's pain he shall see, and shall be richly satisfied. By his knowledge my righteous servant shall make many righteous, and shall take away their iniquities.

12. Therefore I will give him his portion with princes, and with mighty men he shall share the spoil: because he yieldeth his life to death, and is numbered with transgressors; yea, the sin of many he beareth, and intercedeth for transgressors."

Well may the translator add—"If the Scriptures are of any use to mankind, if they convey any definite sentiments, if we can at all rely on the meaning of words, if the strength and variety of phrase here employed by the wisdom of inspiration can avail to inform and impress our minds,—WE MUST believe that the Messiah would devote himself as a voluntary SACRIFICE, a real and effectual EXPIATION, suffering the heaviest woes and all the bitterness of DEATH, in concurrence with the gracious intentions of Jehovah, and for the salvation of rebellious men."

There is one objection, however, raised on this passage, which deserves notice. It is the reference made to it by St. Matthew. Ch. viii. 16, 17. "When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick; *that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.*" The words referred to by the Evangelist are evidently those translated above—"Surely our sufferings he

beareth, and our pains he supporteth." This, say Unitarians, shews that when Christ is said to bear our sins, it means that he bore them *away*; for if by bearing our sins it were meant that he took them upon himself to atone for them by suffering, the prophecy could not have been fulfilled by his healing or bearing away bodily diseases. Now supposing we were to allow that all the declarations in scripture of Christ bearing our sins did mean that he bore them away, what would it come to? The question would still remain, *How did he bear them away?* We should reply, By atoning for them; the Unitarian would reply, By teaching us to bear them away ourselves. We should just be where we were, and have to appeal to scripture, as we do now, to decide the question. But the objection, though a very fair one at first sight, is entirely removed by a close examination of the texts in their original languages. Archbishop Magee, in his elaborate dissertation No. 42, has shown that the first part of the sentence, both in the Hebrew of Isaiah and the Greek of Matthew, means "He hath borne *away* our sicknesses;" and that the second part of the sentence in both Isaiah and Matthew means "He hath *borne* our sorrows." So that not only do the prophet and evangelist agree in their meaning, but they agree in confirming the doctrine which we are now proving. Perhaps from the whole of the Old Testament St. Matthew could not have chosen a text, which would have more exactly suited the double object he had in view, namely, to prove from Christ's miracles that he was the promised Messiah, and then to lead on the minds of his Jewish readers to that great Redemption, which it was foretold he should accomplish by his own sufferings.

Heb. ix. 28. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time *without sin* unto salvation." If the preceding verses are not thought amply sufficient to shew what the Apostle meant by Christ being *offered* to bear our sins, the words "without sin" place it beyond all doubt. What could be the meaning of his coming the *second time* without sin, unless he had come the first time *with* sin. But Jesus had no sin of his own; for he was "holy, harmless, undefiled;" it can only refer therefore to the sins of the world which were imputed to him. The Apostle's meaning evidently is—"The first time that Jesus appeared on earth, he came as the sinner's substitute, voluntarily *bearing* or taking upon himself their sins, for which he was *offered* up as a sacrifice on the cross. But this was done *once* for all: for when he appears the second time, he will not come then as a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief, bearing the the world's *sin*, and humbling himself even to the death upon the cross; but he will come in great glory to confer on those, who look for him in faith, the everlasting *salvation* which he purchased for them by his sufferings."

2 Cor. v. 21. "For he hath made him, who knew no sin, to be *sin for us*, that we might be made the righteousness of

God in him." This is a plain declaration, that our sins were imputed to or laid upon Christ. He was not made *sinful*, observe, but *sin*. If it be contended, that the word "sin" here means a sin-offering, it will only confirm the doctrine we are defending; and at the same time prove, that the slaying of the sin-offering represented the sacrifice of Christ, and not the death of sin according to Mr. Barker's theory. Whether the word mean sin or sin-offering, the contrast must be between a righteous person being put in the sinner's place and the sinner in consequence being put in *his* place, that is, considered and treated as righteous.

Pet. ii. 24. "Who his own self *bare our sins in his own body* on the tree, that we being dead to sins should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed."

Matt. xxvi. 26—23. "And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat: this is my body (St. Luke adds, "which is given for you"). And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many *for the remission of sins*

1 Pet. iii. 18. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, *the just for the unjust*, that he might bring us to God."

Heb. ii. 9. "But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honour: *that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man.*"

Rom. viii. 32. "He that spared not his own Son, *but delivered him up for us all*, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things?"

2 Cor. v. 14, "For the love of Christ constraineth us: because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead." The force of this passage is rather weakened in our translation; it should be "then all died;" that is, Christ having died as our *substitute* or *representative*, all believers, by virtue of their union with him, are considered as having endured the penalty of death due to their sins, so that "there is now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." It is on the strength of this mysterious union between Christ and his people, that the Apostle exclaims, "*I am crucified with Christ*: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and *gave himself for me.*"

But it is needless to multiply further instances of this kind: let us therefore now proceed to consider the doctrine of

## REDEMPTION.

We have already shewn that the *sacrifices* of the Jewish law were intended to direct the minds of the worshippers to the great sacrifice, which was to be offered on the cross of Calvary. But the typical meaning of the law was not confined to sacrifices. Every single rite and ceremony, down to the

minutest particular, was so definitely fixed by God, that in all of them no doubt "the Holy Ghost signified" something real and spiritual. They were "patterns of heavenly things." Now amongst their various ordinances we find Redemption to be a very prominent one. Many parts of the law seem evidently designed to familiarise their minds with that idea, and to press it upon their attention. One person or thing is continually *redeemed* with another; the person or thing given for the other being called a *ransom*: and this generally with respect to *life* and *death*. The fact is too well known to require proof; but a few passages may as well be given. "And every firstling of an ass shalt thou redeem with a lamb: and if thou wilt not redeem it, then thou shalt break his neck: and all the first-born of man among thy children shalt thou redeem." Ex. xiii. 13. "Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto the Lord, whether it be of men or beasts, shall be thine: nevertheless the first-born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem. And those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou redeem, according to thine estimation for the money of five shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, which is twenty gerahs. But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy: thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto the Lord." Numb. xviii. 15—17. "After that he is sold, he may be redeemed again; one of his brethren may redeem him." Lev. xxv. 48. "If there be laid on him a sum of money, then he shall give for the ransom of his life whatsoever is laid upon him." Ex. xxi. 30. "Then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto the Lord." Ex. xxx. 12. &c., &c.

But though the ideas of Ransom and Redemption were made so familiar to their minds, the Jews were plainly told that all these were only typical of a far higher redemption: for David declares, "None of them can by any means redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him: for the redemption of their soul is precious, and it ceaseth for ever." Ps. xlix. 7, 8. Nor were they left in any doubt as to *the person*, who should effect the great redemption: for in their inspired writings they would read—"I (Jehovah) will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death." Hos. xiii. 14. "The ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." Is xxxv. 10. "God will redeem my soul from the grave." Ps. xlix. 15. "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God, whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another." Job xix. 23. "O Lord, my strength, and my Redeemer." Ps. xix. 14. "As for our Redeemer, the Lord of Hosts is his name." Ps. xlvii. 4. "With the Lord is plenteous redemp-

tion." Ps. cxxx. 7. That this great Redeemer would give *his life* as their ransom, was foreshown to them in the death of their sacrifices, as well as by distinct prophecies, such as those of Isaiah and Daniel which have already been mentioned. Let us then turn to the New Testament, and see what light it throws upon this subject.

"Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a *ransom* for many" Matt. xx. 28. "Who gave himself a *ransom* for all." 1 Tim. ii. 6. "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to *redeem* them that are under the law." Gal. iv. 5. "Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." Tit. ii. 14. "Christ hath *redeemed* us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." Gal. iii. 13. "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot" 1 Pet. i. 18, 19. "Thou hast *redeemed* us to God by thy blood." Rev. v. 9. "In whom we have *redemption* through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Eph. i. 7. "In whom we have *redemption* through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Col. i. 14. "Having obtained eternal *redemption* for us." Heb. ix. 12. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death for the *redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant*, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix. 15. "The church of God, which he hath *purchased* with his own blood." Acts xx. 28. "For ye are *bought* with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's." 1 Cor. vi. 20. "Even denying the Lord, that *bought* them." 1 Pet. ii. 1. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*; that, according as it is written, *He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.*" 1 Cor. i. 30, 31.

To the above may be added the following texts, where the words *save*, or *saviour* are used. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall *save* his people from their sins." Matt. i. 21. "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to *save* sinners." 1 Tim. i. 15. "Neither is there *salvation* in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be *saved*." Acts iv. 12. "This is Christ, the *Saviour* of the world." John iv. 42. "Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a *Saviour*." Acts v. 31. "Grace, mercy and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ our *Saviour*." Tit. i. 4. "Through Jesus Christ our *Saviour*." Tit. iii. 6. "Our Lord and *Saviour* Jesus Christ." 2 Pet. ii. 20. "The Father sent the Son to be the *Saviour* of the world." 1 John iv. 14.

Now the way in which Mr. Barker attempts to get over these declarations of scripture, is this. He observes, that we

are always said to be saved from *sin*, to be redeemed from *iniquity*; and therefore contends that, when the Apostles speak of Christ saving or redeeming us, they mean that he gave us such instructions and set us such an example, as, *if we follow them*, will lead us from sin to holiness; in other words, that he saves us in the same sense as St. James exhorts us to save one another, "Let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins:" and that the Saviour is said to pay a price for our redemption, because he was willing to undergo a cruel death to confirm his doctrine. To which I would make the following replies.

1. This theory exalts the sinner, and lowers the Saviour; it makes man his own saviour in a much higher sense than Christ is his saviour. According to this, Jesus saves us by teaching us to save ourselves, he is our propitiation by teaching us to propitiate God ourselves, he bears away our sins by teaching us to bear them away ourselves. Even Unitarians have felt how inconsistent these views are with the mere calling Christ our Saviour at all. In the *Monthly Repository* for March, 1813, p. 182, a correspondent writes as follows—"I agree with you in what you say on the doctrine of redemption: but why do we, Unitarians, not believing the common notion concerning it, call Jesus Christ "our Saviour?" Our teacher, divinely inspired, he certainly was; but does not *saviour* imply something *more*? And is not our using the term as we do, implying an acquiescence in the abominable doctrine of a sacrifice for our sins?" The word "*saviour*" does no doubt imply something more; and let any one, who knows how constantly it is applied to Jesus in the New Testament, what fullness and completeness are there attributed to his glorious work on the cross, judge whether the writers would have been at all likely to use such expressions, if they had merely looked upon him as a teacher.

2. But this theory is flatly contracted in a text already quoted—"Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven, given among men, whereby we must be saved." In the Unitarian sense, there is salvation in Moses, in the Prophets, and in the Apostles; for no one will deny that if a man perfectly kept the moral precepts taught by them, he would be saved. Our Lord himself says, "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;" and God himself says, "He that doeth these things shall live by them:" so that if a man was to be saved by *doing* any thing, Christ's teaching was quite unnecessary, because there was a perfect law already given. Besides, in this sense, St. James says that by converting a sinner from the error of his way *we* may *save* him; so that, if salvation or redemption were nothing more than what Unitarians contend for, Jesus would not be the "*only* Saviour." Mr. Barker also asserts, that the writings of Mahomet, Cicero, or Plato, if rightly used, would "guide

men to God and to heaven;"\* in which case, there would be Unitarian salvation in *their* names.

3. If Jesus dying for us only meant, that he died to confirm his doctrine for our benefit—his Apostles did the same. Why then should all the efficacy be ascribed to *his* death? And how could David say, "None of them may redeem his brother, nor give to God a ransom for him."? "To the piety and constancy, the sufferings and martyrdom, of Christ's immediate disciples, we are immensely indebted; as in those facts, combined with their peculiar circumstances, we find the evidence of the divine origin of Christianity, and the most edifying lessons of every virtue. Neither were they insensible to the benefit which would hence accrue to the cause of religion; and the contemplation of it was to their disinterested spirits a source of the purest delight. 'Yea, if even I be poured out as the libation upon my sacrifice and ministerial service [for the establishment] of your faith, I myself rejoice, and I congratulate you all.' Phil. ii. 17. 'I now rejoice in my sufferings for you; and I go on to endure in my flesh what yet remain of these afflictions [for the cause] of Christ, for [the good of] his body, which is the church.' Col. i. 24. Thus strongly does the apostle recognise the fact, of the great advantages to be derived from his own sufferings to his fellow-christians. But how does he shrink back from putting those advantages in *the same relation* to the salvation of mankind, which belonged to the sufferings of his Lord! 'Was Paul crucified for you?' 1 Cor. i. 13." †

4. "According to this reasoning, our benefit from the death of Christ is only one part of the general sum of blessing derived from him; and to which his exemplary life, his doctrines, his miracles, and above all, his resurrection, contributed as much, or more, than his death. We should, therefore, have expected to find the forgiveness of our sins, and deliverance from condemnation, ascribed equally to any or to all of these. But how different is the fact! Christ lived, and taught, and proved his Divine commission for us; and we have thus a most important benefit from him in those respects; but it is to his *sufferings* and *death alone* that the New Testament attributes the putting away of sin, remission, propitiation, reconciliation, redemption, and peace with God. This very marked difference deserves most serious consideration from those who deny, or doubt, the doctrine of the atonement." ‡

5. The object of Christ's death is stated in one place to be "to redeem us from the cause of the law," and in another "for the redemption of the transgressions *that were under the first testament*," agreeably to what is elsewhere said of Christ being a propitiation "to declare God's righteousness for the remission of sins *that are past*." How, on Mr. Barker's theory, Christ could redeem persons, who had died hundreds of years before, I am at a loss to conceive! He could not teach *them* to repent and serve God!

\* Newcastle Discussion, p. 228. † Dr. Pye Smith. ‡ Dr. Pye Smith.

6. By referring to the texts which mention the work of redemption, you will observe that it is generally spoken of as a thing already accomplished on the cross, "*Having obtained eternal redemption for us,*" "when he *had by himself* purged (that is, made purification of or for) our sins," &c, &c. Mr. Barker answers this, by referring to the text, which says, that Jesus "abolished death." 2 Tim. i. 10. Here, he contends, is a thing described as already done, which is in fact *not* done, but only begun. This certainly seems making pretty free with scripture: but on turning to the original, the apparent necessity for it vanishes; as the Greek word does not mean *actually to do away with*, but rather *to make of none effect*, as it is translated in other places. The meaning of the expression is, that Christ, by the redemption accomplished on the cross, took away, the *sting* of death, and disarmed it of its terrors; in consequence of which, although it is still "appointed unto all men once to die," yet to the believer death is nothing but the door, through which he passes into eternal life.

7. It is evident, that to be redeemed from *sin*, we must be redeemed from the *punishment* of what we have already committed, as well as from the *practice* of it for the future. It would be very poor redemption, only to be converted and sanctified by the gospel, while eternal death was still hanging over us for our past sins. The Unitarian, I know, would tell us, that those sins are forgiven; but God himself solemnly pronounced it to be one essential part of his character, that he "will by no means clear" it; and has taught us in his word, that "without shedding of blood is no remission." From which it appears, that it would be of little value to us to be "redeemed from all iniquity" for the future, unless we were also "redeemed from the curse of the law" for the past.

8. It must likewise be remembered, that it is only the application of the atoning blood of Jesus to the sinner's soul by the Holy Spirit, that can deliver him from the power of sin, and bring him out of darkness into light. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth (typically) to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?" Heb. ix. 13, 14. We can only love God, by being made to feel that he first loved us, and gave his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. 1 John iv. 10—19.

9. And lastly; let me remind you in the words of the writer so often quoted before, "that our doctrine concerning the design and the effect of the sufferings of Jesus, *has not produced* those sufferings. They are the same, and the facts are unalterable, whatever opinion be set up concerning their reason and moral cause, under the divine government. Which idea then, is the most worthy of the wisdom and benevolence of God; the one which attributes to the sufferings of our Lord an effect beyond all description important and valuable, con-



ferring infinite good upon innumerable myriads of beings, and spreading its beneficent influence through all eternity; or the other, which regards *the same* sufferings as nothing more than a proof of the sufferer's integrity, and an example of patient endurance, to be imitated by other sufferers, *if they should be so disposed?* Neither could the sufferings of Christ, if their expiatory or atoning quality be put out of the consideration, be of any service as a declaration of the general mercy of God, and his readiness to pardon sinners upon repentance. Surely it would, in all reason, bear the contrary way. If that pure and spotless One, in whom the Father was ever well pleased, was pressed down with a load so dreadful, not of outward sufferings only, but of an inward and mysterious anguish, the intenseness of which we have no means nor power of computing; what must be expected to fall upon us, who are conscious of transgressions innumerable and unspeakable against the law and majesty of Heaven?"

Having thus, under various heads, endeavoured to shew what scripture teaches concerning the work of Christ, let us direct your attention to two remarkable circumstances, one at the opening, and the other at the close of his ministry; neither of which will bear any rational explanation, except on the supposition, that Jesus was the sinner's substitute, and bearing in his own person a world's transgressions.

In Matt. iii. 13—15 we read "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee unto Jordan to John, to be baptised of him. But John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." "Look at that scene! The extortioner, the unjust, the profane, the profligate, the generation of vipers, all collected together before the spirit-stirring, conscience-arousing messenger of God, confessing their sins and submitting to his baptism, Amongst them is one mysterious Being before whom the prophet stands awe-struck. All divine as was his commission he dared not undertake to class such a one with sinners, or to venture to bless one so infinitely above him. In suitable humility he exclaims, 'I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?' Hear then, his answer. "It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness." Look at his countenance, sinless, spotless, holy, the love and the purity of heaven breathing in its every feature, and yet there he is amongst the unholy and the profane, there he is meekly submitting to the appointed ordinance of God. 'It becometh us.' Why was it suitable? Can those tell who deny his substituted righteousness, and his *having taken upon him our sins?* It became him because the Lord had laid upon him the iniquity of us all. Is. liii. 6. '*He was made sin for us.*' 2 Cor. v. 21." \*

Let us now go to Mount Calvary, and listen to the voice of Jesus as he hangs upon the cross. What is he saying? "My

God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" What! a sinless martyr forsaken by God in his dying hour! A man who did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; who spent his whole life in self-denying acts for the service of God, and the good of his fellow creatures; to be forsaken by God at last! Is that the way God treats his faithful servants? Was any other martyr, even though *not* sinless, ever thus deserted in the hour of trial? No! It is then that God's presence has always cheered and comforted them the most; and enabled them to rejoice even in the midst of their dying agonies. Never did any martyr but one exclaim at such a time, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" And yet out of them all he alone was "holy, harmless, undefiled," absolutely "without sin." Why was this? There can be but one answer—He was made sin for us; he hung upon the cross as our substitute; he took upon himself the whole load of human guilt, and bound it so closely to him, that for the time it became by imputation his own, and he thus presented himself before God to answer for, and to expiate, it all. The punishment due to that sin was separation from the presence and favour of God; and therefore did the Father *judicially* withdraw from his expiring Son all sensible tokens of his gracious presence, just as he would have done, had that Son really committed the sins for which he was then atoning.\* "Oh the glorious nature of that exchange," exclaimed a martyred reformer, "the sinless one is condemned, and the guilty goes free; the blessing bears the curse, and the cursed is blessed; the life dies, and the dead live; the glory is overwhelmed in darkness, and he who knew nothing but confusion of face is clothed with glory."

\* The miraculous darkness, which overspread the whole earth at that time, was no doubt a sign of the spiritual desertion Jesus was then suffering. There is a remarkable saying recorded of an Eastern astronomer; who, knowing nothing of what was happening at Jerusalem, and not being able to account for the darkness by an eclipse (which could not possibly occur at that time) or any other natural cause, declared, that either God must be suffering, or some one, with whom God sympathised.

## LECTURE XIV.

### JUSTIFICATION.

"Sirs, what must I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Acts xvi. 30, 31.

SOME of you might be surprised, that no notice was taken in our last Lecture of those numerous passages of Scripture, in which pardon and salvation are connected with good works; especially as Unitarians lay so much stress upon them. But these more properly come under the head of Justification; inasmuch as they concern, not the fact of the Atonement, but the way in which each individual is to obtain an interest in it. A person, who holds the doctrine of Justification by Works, may believe in the Atonement, just as much as one who holds the doctrine of Justification by Faith. The Church of Rome for instance, pronounces every one accursed, who does not hold both the Atonement and Justification by Works. Suppose we admitted, that pardon was offered to us solely on condition of repentance and reformation, there would still remain the question, Was not an Atonement necessary to render such an offer consistent with God's majesty and holiness? The question, however, in that case, would be a very unimportant one; all our business would then be to fulfil the conditions required. But if Scripture teaches us, that we can only be saved by having an interest in Christ's Atonement, that we can only obtain an interest in it by faith, and that a belief in the doctrine of the Atonement is an essential part of that saving faith, then the question becomes one of the most vital importance. And this is what we have now to consider. We want a full scriptural answer to the inquiry, "What must I do to be saved?"

It is evident, that the Apostle's reply, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," only throws us back upon Scripture, to learn what "believing on him" means; or in other words, to learn *what* we are to believe about him. Perhaps the shortest, and at the same time most comprehensive, statement of this, is that in 1 John, v. 1. "Whosoever believeth, that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." Unita-

rians lay great stress on this and such like passages, to prove that, even if the doctrines of the Trinity, Atonement, &c., be true, a belief in them can not be necessary to salvation. They argue, and very justly, that if a man "believes that Jesus is the Christ," he must be "born of God," and therefore he must be saved, whatever else he may believe or disbelieve. But now suppose the Philippian jailor had said to Paul and Silas, "Oh yes, I'll believe anything that will save me, and I'll believe any thing that you tell me: I'm perfectly willing to be baptised directly, and profess my belief that Jesus is the Christ, if it will save me"—what would have been their answer? Why no doubt they would have told him, that such a faith as that was no faith at all, and could do him no good; that he could not believe Jesus to be the Christ *with the heart*, until he knew what "the Christ" meant; that it was impossible for him to believe *on* the Lord Jesus savingly, until he knew who Jesus was, and what he had done, and why he was to believe on him; for that saving faith was, not a mere belief or acknowledgment of certain words, but a personal and spiritual acceptance of Jesus *as our Saviour*, a thankful embracing of God's mercy *as it is offered to us in the gospel*. Therefore, after they had allayed his first agony of terror by assuring him that there *was* a way of salvation for him through the Saviour they preached, it naturally follows "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord": that is, they preached the gospel to him; they unfolded the plan of salvation in the person and work of Jesus Christ. This being done, he was allowed to express his faith by being baptised with all his house: and by that faith, it is evident from the account, he was saved.

But now suppose he had said, "You tell me, that the word 'Christ' means 'anointed;' that it is customary amongst the Jews for a person to be consecrated to the office of a Prophet, a Priest, or a King, by the ceremony of anointing him, that is pouring oil upon his head; and therefore, that Jesus is called the Christ, because he is appointed by God to be our Prophet, Priest, and King; our Prophet to teach us, our Priest to atone and intercede for us, our King to reign over us. Now I believe, that he is our Prophet, and perhaps our King also; but I cannot believe that he is our Priest, or at least in such a sense as that he has offered up an atoning sacrifice for our sins, through which alone we can be pardoned and be received into God's favour; nor can I believe on him as 'our great God and Saviour.' I fully admit that he is the Christ, and heartily believe on him, but not exactly in the same sense that you do." What would Paul and Silas have answered? Would they have said, Well, we don't insist on such theological niceties; if you believe on Jesus as the Christ according to your own view of it, you are a Christian, and we may waive all

minor differences? Not indeed. They would have told him, that the object of his faith might be a Christ of his own imagination, but it was not *the* Christ whom they were sent to preach, it was not *the* Christ whom God had sent to be the Saviour of sinners, it was not *the* Christ who was pre-ordained before the foundation of the world, it was not *the* Christ who had been held up to the eye of faith in type and prophecy ever since the fall of Adam, nor was it *the* Christ whose name was the *only one* under heaven given among men whereby any can be saved. They would have told him in fact, that with such views he did *not* believe Jesus to be the Christ, and that unless he felt his need of such a Saviour as they preached, and was willing to accept him *in all his offices*, he had neither part nor lot in the matter.

The question therefore as to what it is necessary to believe about Jesus, in order to be saved, has been virtually answered in the preceding Lectures. We have there shown, that *the* Christ was the only-begotten Son of God, made flesh, and sent into the world to be a sacrifice, propitiation, ransom, or atonement for sin. If this be the fact, of course no one, who denies it, can believe that Jesus is "*the* Christ," nor in consequence have any interest in his salvation. Constantly bear this in mind, and it will throw light upon most of those texts, which Unitarians bring forward to prove that a man may believe almost anything, and yet be a Christian.\*

But in order to understand thoroughly what is saving faith, we must not only know *what* we are to believe, but also *how* we are to believe; in other words, we must know the *nature* of faith, as well as its *object*. Might not some member of the Philippian jailor's family, or other person present, have believed every word of what Paul and Silas said, as much as he did, and yet not have been saved by it? Undoubtedly he might. Then what would have been the difference between these two men? It could not have been in the *object* of their faith, because they both believed exactly the same, their creeds were alike: it could only be in the *nature* of their faith, that is, *in the way* in which they believed those truths. One

\* Mr. Barker argues, that it can only be necessary to receive Jesus as our Prophet; because he himself says, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor." Luke iv. 18. But does it follow, because Jesus here declares himself anointed to be a prophet, that he therefore could not be anointed to be any thing else as well? Besides, what gospel did Jesus preach? Why that he came "to give his life a ransom for many," and to shed his blood "for the remission of sins." And this gospel he preached still more fully by the mouth of his inspired apostles. Therefore they, who deny this, reject Jesus in his prophetic, just as much as in his priestly, office. The meaning of "the Christ" altogether depends upon what the work was, which God sent his Son to perform: and this, we hope, has been already sufficiently shown.

would be a dead, and the other a living, faith. A dead faith may be quite orthodox; "the devils believe:" saving faith therefore must be something more than orthodox.

This may be illustrated by the case of two men, who have fallen into the water. A person throws out a rope to them, assuring them, that if they will lay hold of it, he will pull them safely on shore. Both of them believe him; neither of them doubt either the strength of the rope, or the person's power and willingness to draw them out of the water. But one of them feels that he is sinking, knows that he cannot swim ashore himself, sees that there is no other possible way of being saved, and therefore thankfully lays hold of the rope, and is drawn safely to land. The other does not feel that he is in any danger, fancies himself able to swim ashore, or from some cause or other has such a dislike to being drawn out by the rope, that he keeps putting it off, until he sinks for the last time, and is drowned. Now observe, if the creed of the saved man had not been orthodox with regard to the person on shore and the rope that was thrown out to him—if he had not believed that there was such a rope, or if he had not thought it strong enough to bear him, or if he had disbelieved either the power or willingness of the person, who held the rope, to pull him out, he would not have laid hold of it, and consequently, with all his desire to be saved, he would have been drowned. But although an orthodox creed was absolutely necessary to his safety, yet the case of the other man showed that something more was necessary; for his creed too was orthodox, and yet he was drowned.

So it may be with two persons, who both believe the facts of the gospel—suppose the Philippian jailor and another person present on the occasion. The jailor was convinced of sin, made to feel his danger, and desired to be saved from it. As Paul and Silas preached the gospel to him, the Spirit of God carried it with power to his heart; he was enabled spiritually to discern it, and to see how exactly suitable it was to his own case—he felt that what they said must be true, for it was as the voice of God speaking pardon and peace to his soul. He saw that in no other way could such a guilty sinner as himself be received into the favour of a holy God, he believed that in that way he would be accepted, "and he rejoiced, believing in God." Again, he felt that, notwithstanding all his desire to show his gratitude to God for such stupendous mercy in giving his only Son to die for him, he was utterly weak and unable to do any thing good of himself; but in the gospel was provided not only pardon for the past, but also grace for the future; in Christ he found a Saviour not only from the guilt, but also from the power, of sin: and thus he had the assurance of a growing victory now over the world, the flesh, and the

devil, and at the end of his warfare a complete and eternal deliverance from every taint of corruption. Having then found in Christ just such a Saviour as his case required, he believed on him with all his heart, he accepted him as Saviour, *and by that faith he was saved.* The other person might be convinced from the evident sincerity of the Apostles, confirmed by their miraculous deliverance from prison, that the story they told must be true, and therefore he might so far "believe that Jesus was the Christ;" but he might never have been convinced of sin by the Spirit of God, he might have no real sense of his guilt and danger, and therefore see no necessity for embracing Christ as *his* Saviour: or he might have such a dislike to the spirit and conduct, which he would hear Christ required of all his followers, as would shut the door of his heart, and make him refuse the gospel offer. This man's faith, though orthodox, would be that dead faith, which St. James tells us can never save. His continuing in sin would too clearly prove, that he was unwilling to receive Jesus as his Prophet or his King; and they, who are so, can have no interest in his Atonement or intercession as the great High Priest. A sinner must accept Jesus as "the Christ" *altogether*, or not at all.

This great doctrine, that there is but one way of Salvation for guilty man, namely a living faith in Jesus Christ as his Saviour, was the sum and substance of Apostolic teaching. The New Testament, as every one knows, is full of it. Some few of its declarations are as follows. "He that *believeth*, and is baptised, shall be saved." Mark xvi. 16. "That whosoever *believeth* in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 15. "He that *believeth* on the Son hath everlasting life." John iii. 36. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one, which seeth the Son, and *believeth* on him, may have everlasting life." John vi. 40. "I am the resurrection and the life; he that *believeth* in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth, and *believeth* in me, shall never die. *Believest thou this?* She saith unto him, Yea, Lord; I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world." John xi. 25, 27. "That through his name, whosoever *believeth* in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts x. 43. "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood.*" Rom. iii. 25. "The Holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, *through faith* which is in Christ Jesus." 2 Tim. iii. 15. "Who are kept by the power of God *through faith* unto salvation." 1 Peter i. 5. "That we should be to the praise of his glory, who first *trusted in Christ.* In whom ye also *trusted*, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation." Eph. i. 12, 13. "Lest they

*believe*, and be saved." Luke viii. 12. "For by grace are ye saved *through faith*; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God." Eph. ii. 8. "In his name shall the Gentiles *trust*." Matt. xii. 21. "Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that *believeth on him* shall not be confounded." 1 Peter ii. 5. "I know whom I have *believed*, (or *trusted*,) and am persuaded, that he is able to keep that which I have *committed unto him* against that day." 2 Tim. i. 12.

Such are the terms used by our Lord and his Apostles, when publishing the gospel of salvation to perishing sinners. But even in the life-time of the Apostles heresies of various kinds sprung up, which compelled them to go beyond these general proclamations of the gospel, and to enter into very close argument respecting some of its details. In particular it seems to have been very difficult with the converted Jews, to set them free from a superstitious attachment to their old ritual; and with the converted Gentiles to root out all trust in their own righteousness. Neither of these denied the fact of the Atonement, or that remission of sins was through the blood of Christ; but they both thought that something else was required for themselves to do, to procure the pardon of their sins, and deserve the favour of God. In each case the principle was the same,—a mixing up of grace and works, a salvation procured partly by Christ and partly by themselves, the Redeemer's Atonement with something meritorious on their part to obtain an interest in it. What the meritorious work was, which they aimed at performing—whether an observance of certain ceremonies, or of certain moral duties—made no difference. There was certainly this difference, that the moral duties were required of every Christian, while the ceremonies were not; but as a ground of trust before God, *as a way of salvation*, one was as utterly worthless as the other, and as utterly inconsistent with the free grace of the gospel, with a complete acceptance of Christ's salvation, and with that deep sense of his own vileness, which every enlightened Christian is made to feel. The Apostles therefore, although we can generally discover from their line of argument, which part of the law their hearers were in danger of trusting in, whether moral or ceremonial, are often quite indifferent about distinguishing it accurately, inasmuch as it made no practical difference. They cut down all trust in the works of *the law* generally, and showed the impossibility of a fallen creature like man being saved by *any* part of it whatsoever.

In order fully to enter into their teaching on this subject, we must first examine the meaning of "justification," which is the word generally used in the argumentative parts of their Epistles. To *justify* a person is to account, consider, or pronounce him *just* or righteous. This is a very different thing,



you will observe, from *pardoning* him. If the jury bring in a verdict of "guilty" against a man, the judge may pardon him, but that does not *justify* him: his character is not cleared; he leaves the bar with all the stain of his guilt upon him; he has only escaped the punishment; he is still a *criminal*. But if the jury bring in a verdict of "not guilty," then he is justified, cleared, acquitted; he is considered and pronounced just or righteous, as far as this charge against him is concerned. Now St. Paul makes justification a necessary part of man's salvation; "Whom he did predestinate them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified: and whom he justified, them he also glorified." Rom. viii. 30. But how can a condemned guilty sinner like man, be justified in the sight of God? One could understand how he might be pardoned; but pardon and justification are as totally distinct as any two things can possibly be. And this is another remarkable thing about a sinner's salvation, that he is *both* pardoned and justified—which in any ordinary case would be impossible; pardon being a thing which can only follow *condemnation*, justification being a thing which can only follow *acquittal*. How then can we be both condemned and justified? How can the law of God pronounce us both guilty and not guilty? The simple answer, which Scripture gives us, is this: In ourselves we are condemned, in Christ we are justified; in ourselves we are guilty sinners, in Christ we are perfectly righteous. And therefore we are not only pardoned as sinners, but also through the merits and death of Christ justified as righteous.

This doctrine is presented to us in God's word, under the following heads. We are said to be justified by the righteousness and death of Christ, by faith, by works, by God, by grace.

1. We are justified by the righteousness and death of Christ, because by the sacrifice of himself he made a full Atonement for our sins, and because the perfect righteousness, which he wrought out for his people, is imputed to them.
2. We are justified by faith, because it is on our believing that Christ's righteousness is imputed to us, and we become interested in all the blessings of his salvation.
3. We are justified by works, because they are the fruits which a living faith always brings forth, and therefore justify now before men, and will justify at the day of judgment, our claims to being Christ's people.
4. We are justified by God, because it is he, who, as supreme judge, authoritatively pronounces us justified, in virtue of our union with Christ; and against whose decision there is no appeal: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth; who is he that condemneth?"
5. We are justified by grace, firstly, because it was an act of stupendous grace, that God "spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for

us all," thus providing a Saviour whose blood "cleanses us from all sin," and in whose righteousness we may stand justified before God; and secondly, because it is also of free grace, that the Spirit is sent into our hearts, to convince us of sin, to lead us to the foot of the cross in penitence and faith, and thus give us an interest in the atoning sacrifice and justifying righteousness of our great Redeemer.

Perhaps the best way of arranging our proofs from scripture on this important question will be as follows:—To shew; First, That no righteousness of our own can justify us in the sight of God; Secondly, That the righteousness, which can and does justify us, is that of Christ; Thirdly, That that justifying righteousness is applied to us by faith alone; and then to examine those texts, which are thought to contradict this doctrine.

I. It must be perfectly evident to every one on a moment's reflection, from the very meaning of the word, that nothing but a *perfect* righteousness can *justify* any creature in the sight of God. For a creature to be justified before his Creator, he must be able to clear himself from any charge whatever which can be brought against him; that is, he must have perfectly fulfilled all that his Creator requires of him; he must have done every thing that he ought to do, and nothing that he ought not to do. If he fail in a single thing—he may certainly be pardoned but—he cannot be justified; he cannot possibly be "justified from all things,"\* which is the only justification that can be of the least avail, inasmuch as "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." James ii. 10. A creature having once sinned can never be justified *in himself*, that is by his own righteousness, even though he should yield God a perfect obedience ever afterwards: for that obedience, however perfect, is nothing more than just what is required of him for the time being, and cannot possibly do away with his past guilt. God might promise to *pardon* a sinner, provided he never sinned again, but that would not *justify* him. A very few texts therefore will suffice, if indeed any are required, to prove that no child of Adam can be justified by any righteousness of his own; especially as we considered the subject of man's fallen nature in a preceding Lecture. "What is man, that he should be clean; or he that is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" Job xv. 14. "Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord;" for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." Ps. cxliii. 2 "There is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Eccl. vii. 20. "There is none righteous, no, not one." Rom. iii. 10.

\* Acts xiii. 39.

"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight" Rom. iii. 20. "There is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." Rom. iii. 23. "How should man be just with God?" Job ix. 2.

II. As "no man living," therefore, can be justified by any righteousness of his own, he must have some other righteousness, and that a perfect one, *imputed* to him for his justification. And this, Scripture teaches us, is the righteousness of Christ, which he wrought out for all his people, as their head and representative. "Surely, shall one say, *in the Lord have I righteousness* and strength: even to him shall all men come; and all that are incensed against him shall be ashamed. *In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified, and shall glory.*" Is. xlv. 24, 25. "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, *The Lord our righteousness.*" Jer. xxiii. 5, 6. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, *and righteousness*, and sanctification, and redemption; that, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." 1 Cor. i. 30, 31. According to Unitarian interpretation, three of those things, which Jesus is said to be made unto us—righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, would all mean precisely the same; namely, that Jesus redeemed us from sin, or sanctified us, by teaching us, and setting us an example of, righteousness. But every one must see, that the apostle meant to point out the several different blessings, which we receive from Christ. He is made unto us redemption, because he has redeemed us by his blood from the curse of God's broken law; he is made unto us righteousness, because he has worked out a perfect righteousness, which is imputed to us for our justification; he is made unto us wisdom and sanctification, because by his spirit he gives us heavenly wisdom and holiness of heart. "He hath made him, who knew no sin, be sin for us, that we might be made *the righteousness of God in him.*" Cor. v. 21. Christ was not made *sinful*, but *sin*; that is, our sin was imputed to him, in order that his righteousness might be imputed to us. Hence we are not said to be made *righteous* by him, but made *righteousness* in him, which is a much stronger expression; and that righteousness, which is imputed to us, is called "*the righteousness of God,*" because Jesus Christ was "God manifest in the flesh." Again, "For I bear them record, that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. For they being ignorant of *God's righteousness*, and going about to establish *their own* righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto

the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom x. 2—4. In these last words the apostle explains what he means by "the righteousness of God;" namely, that perfect fulfilling of the law, by which Christ wrought out a justifying righteousness for every believer. "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so *by the righteousness of one* the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, *so by the obedience of one* shall many be made righteous." Rom v. 18., 19.

III. Still further proof of the two preceding positions will be afforded, as we examine the scriptural evidence on the third point; namely, how we become *interested in* that perfect righteousness of Christ, which alone can justify us. In other words, how we are to *put on* that wedding garment, which Christ has woven for us. This is the point, on which the Apostles chiefly insist. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, especially, and the first seven chapters of his Epistle to the Romans, are regular systematic arguments to prove, that it is by *faith alone* we can be justified in the sight of God. We are taught, that when a convinced sinner accepts, and casts himself upon, Christ as his Saviour, he becomes vitally united to him, and interested in all the blessings of his Redemption. Now the only way, in which the upholders of human merit can attempt to get over the conclusive arguments in these Epistles, is by maintaining, that when St. Paul says no one can be justified by the works of the law, he merely means the *ceremonial law*. With respect to the Epistle to the Galatians the objection may appear somewhat plausible, as he does seem there to be addressing persons who had a superstitious regard to some parts of the Levitical law; although in principle it makes little difference, whether human merit be set up on the ground of religious observances, or of moral duties; and the apostle's argument, while directed mainly against any trust in Jewish ceremonies, was no doubt intended to cut down all kinds of self-righteousness. But with regard to the Epistle to the Romans, not only is the objection utterly groundless, but there is demonstrative internal proof, that the writer could not have confined his observations to the ceremonial law. Indeed the supposition is so perfectly inconsistent with the whole scope of his argument, and would turn the greater part of it into such absolute nonsense, that any intelligent and candid person has only carefully to read through the four first chapters, to be for ever convinced of its fallacy. Let us briefly examine them.

The first part of the Apostle's argument continues from ch. i. 18 to ch. iii. 29; and the conclusion, to which it brings

us, is summed up in these words, "*Therefore* by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." We can scarcely lay much stress on the last few words—"by the law is the knowledge of sin"—inasmuch as it might apply both to the ceremonial, and to the moral, law: to the ceremonial law in the same sense as Heb. iii. "In those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year;" to the moral law in the same sense as Rom. v. 20. "The law entered, that sin might abound," and Rom. vii. 13. "That sin *by the commandment* might become exceeding sinful:" both of which latter passages evidently mean, that by a spiritual perception of the requirements of God's law we are made sensible of the extent of our own guilt. But there is a very easy and certain way of finding out what St. Paul meant by "the deeds of the law" in this verse; and that is, by looking at what goes before. "*Therefore* by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight." The word "*therefore*" shews that what goes before is the *reason* why none can be justified by the law; and nothing can be more likely to determine the meaning of the Apostle's *conclusion*, than an examination of his *reasons* for coming to that conclusion.

Now he begins by saying in ch. i. 16. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek." And then he goes on to shew why it is salvation to the *believer*.—"For therein is the *righteousness of God* revealed *from faith to faith*; as it is written, The just shall live by faith."\* These last words are more literally "The just by faith shall live;" that is, he who is *justified by faith* shall have eternal life. Having then stated, that the great "power" of the gospel lies in the doctrine of justification by faith, inasmuch as faith gives the sinner an interest in Christ's justifying righteousness, he proceeds to argue the point, by shewing the impossibility of any son of Adam being justified by works. Now let any one say, supposing the Apostle to have meant only the works of the ceremonial law, what kind of proof would he have brought forward to shew that we could not be justified by them? Would it not necessarily have been the same line of argument, which runs through his Epistle to the Hebrews, namely, that the blood of bulls and of goats could never take away sin, that all those Levitical observances were never any thing but typical, and were now entirely abolished? Undoubtedly it would. And on the other hand let us ask, what sort of proof would have been required, supposing him to have meant that no one could

\* The passage is to be found in Hab. ii. 4, and is quoted no less than three times by St. Paul. Rom. i. 17. Gal. iii. 11. Heb. x. 38.

be justified by *any* kind of works? Would he not have had to shew just two things—1st, that nothing short of a *perfect* righteousness could justify any creature in the sight of his creator; and 2ndly, that no human being had such a righteousness? Surely this is equally clear. Well then, you have only to turn to the Epistle itself, and you will see that this last is precisely the line of argument adopted.

“For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by faith. *For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.*” Here he advances the first point of his argument, namely, that nothing short of a perfect righteousness can justify any creature in the sight of God. If God’s *wrath* is denounced against *all* unrighteousness, it is quite clear that every one must deserve that wrath, who is *at all* unrighteous; and equally clear, that no one can be justified by works which deserve wrath. Therefore, for a creature to be justified on account of his own doings, he must have no unrighteousness whatever. This is so self-evident, that the Apostle spends no time in arguing on it, but proceeds at once to the next point, namely, that *none* of the children of Adam have that perfect righteousness, which would be required for their justification. This he proves, by dividing the whole world into Jew and Gentile, and convicting each of them of sin. His indictment against the Gentiles occupies from ch. i. 20, to ch. ii. 16. In their case he appeals to notorious facts, and gives such an account of Gentile wickedness, as only those who have been in heathen countries can thoroughly appreciate the truth of; although there is not a sin mentioned, but what is more or less perpetrated by professing Christians. He then shows, that their not having a written law is no excuse for them, inasmuch as they had the law of conscience, which told them when they did right and when they did wrong, “their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” You must observe, that from v. 13 to 15 is in a parenthesis, the 12th and 16th being joined together; “As many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law, in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men.” I make this remark, lest you should suppose him to mean, that their consciences would accuse or else excuse them *in the day of judgment*. No doubt their consciences will excuse them with regard to those particular acts, in which they obeyed its dictates; but he has already shown, that none of them do perfectly obey their consciences, and therefore they will stand self-convicted in that day. He says their consciences “*mean while*” excuse them of some things in which they do right, and accuse them of others in which they do wrong. Therefore, as they do many things which they know to be wrong, they never

can be justified by their own righteousness in the sight of God.

With ch. ii. 17 he commences his charge against the Jews. And here it is necessary that he should introduce some remarks on their special privileges as a nation; into which privileges they were admitted by circumcision. This is the only allusion to any thing connected with the Levitical law in the whole argument. And observe *how* he alludes to it. He enters into no lengthened discussion about that law, (which would have been his sole topic, if he had been only proving that we cannot be justified by those ceremonial works,) but he still keeps to his main point, *the convicting them of sin*. He insists, that as regards the matter of justification before God, the circumcised and the uncircumcised stood on exactly the same ground: neither of them could be justified by any thing short of a perfect righteousness, *which neither of them had*. "What then? are we better than they? No, in no wise: for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, *that they are all under sin*." And then he reminds them that scripture gives just the same testimony to man's universal failure. "As it is written, There is *none* righteous; no, not one, &c., &c." So that whether we appeal to scripture or to fact, we are brought to the conclusion, "that *every* mouth may be stopped, and *all the world* become guilty before God." Let the intelligent reader, who has considered St. Paul's arguments, say whether he means only the ceremonial law, when he concludes—"Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall *no flesh* be justified in his sight."

If any one wishes for still further proof of the Apostle's meaning, let him study the next four chapters, which are all a continuation of the same argument. Let him mark especially the few following passages. Chap. iii. 27, 28. "Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Would it exclude boasting, for a man to believe that he could not be justified by ceremonial observances, but that he *could* be justified by the works of the moral law, that is *by his own righteousness*?—Chap. iii. 31. "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." Was the *ceremonial* law "established" by faith? No: it was "made void." All its types having been fulfilled in Christ, it was to be laid aside. But how does the doctrine of justification by faith establish the *moral* law? Why it shews, that God will accept of nothing less than a perfect obedience to it, and that he will not permit the smallest transgression of it to escape with impunity.—Ch. iv. 4. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Is the reward "reckoned of debt" to him that performs the works of

the *ceremonial* law?—Ch. iv. 17. “Because the law worketh wrath; because where no law is, there is no transgression.” Is there no transgression, where there is no *ceremonial* law?—Ch. vii. 7. “What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.” Was it the *ceremonial* or the *moral* law, which said “Thou shalt not covet”? And looking on a few verses, was it the *ceremonial* or the *moral* law, that was “holy,” “just,” “good,” and “spiritual,” and in which St. Paul “*delighted*”? If there can be but one answer to the above questions, which I think we may reasonably take for granted, all dispute must be at an end with regard to the drift of the Apostle’s argument in the early part of this Epistle, which he sums up in the words, “Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.”

Having then proved this important point, he takes up again at Ch. iii. 21 the subject, which he had left at Ch. i. 17, and which had led him into the digression just noticed. “But now the righteousness of God (so called, because it was wrought out by “God manifest in the flesh,” and because it is appointed by God, as the sinner’s justification) without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is (imputed to the sinner) *by faith of Jesus Christ*, unto all and upon all them *that believe*.” And then, as if to cut off all possible pretence for confining his meaning to the *ceremonial* law, he again states the *reason*, “For there is no difference; for *all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” And *therefore*, if justified at all, it must be “*freely by his grace* through the redemption\* that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood*, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare I say at this time his righteousness, that he might be just, and the justifier of him *which believeth in Jesus*. Where is boasting then? It is excluded. By what law? Of works? Nay, but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law.” He then again asserts, that both the circumcision and the uncircumcision, that is both Jew and Gentile, are exactly on the same footing, as respects their justification before God: which he proves from the fact, that Abraham was justified by *imputed* righteousness *through faith* before circumcision or any part of the *ceremonial* law was

\* Another proof, that Redemption does not mean only being delivered from the practise of sin. For if a man was justified by that, he *would be* justified by works. But St. Paul here put justification by works in *opposition* to free gracious justification through the Redemption that is in Christ Jesus.



given. Now if St. Paul meant to teach in this Epistle, that we are to be justified by moral, and not by ceremonial works, (according to the Unitarian theory) his argument would have been, that Abraham was justified *by his own works* without circumcision: instead of which his argument distinctly is, that Abraham was justified by *imputed* righteousness without circumcision, and that he *could not* have been justified by his own righteousness. "What shall we then say, that Abraham our father as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory; but not before God"—that is, we know from scripture, that he could not glory before God: "for what saith the scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was *counted* (or imputed) to him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh (that is, who worketh sufficiently for his justification) is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." If Abraham had had such a righteousness of his own as could justify him before God, his "reward" would have been a matter of "debt," he would have had something "to glory" of, and would not have required an *imputed* righteousness. But as Scripture informs us, that he did require such an act of "grace" as the *counting* of his faith for righteousness, he must, of course, have been *wanting* in righteousness, and therefore could not be justified by his works. "But"—how was he justified? by faith; for—"to him that worketh not (that is, who worketh not sufficiently for justification, in other words, who has not perfectly fulfilled the law), but *believeth* on him that justifieth *the ungodly*, his *faith* is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man, unto whom God *imputeth* righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they, whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered: blessed is the man, to whom the Lord will not impute sin." And then, after showing that this righteousness was imputed to him before he was circumcised, so that the doctrine of justification by faith through the imputed righteousness of Christ, is of universal application to Jew and Gentile alike, he concludes, "Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we *believe* on him that raised up our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification. Therefore, being justified *by faith*, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom also we have access *by faith* into this grace wherein we stand, and rejoice in hope of the glory of God."

It would take us too long to follow the chain of his argument to the end of the 8th chapter; but it is absolutely necessary, that we should notice the objection, which he meets in ch. vi.; inasmuch as it precisely answers to St. James's argu-

ment about justification, on the strength of which Unitarians, Romanists, and others, deny the doctrine of justification by faith alone. It is remarkable how often we find the very objections, which are brought against the truths we teach, mentioned by the inspired writers as likely or possible to be alleged against *their* doctrines. This affords a strong presumption, that our doctrines and theirs are the same; and makes it absolutely certain, that doctrines, which are *not* open to those objections, cannot be Apostolic doctrines. Now what is the objection, which has always been advanced against this doctrine? Why, that it gives people the liberty of sinning on; that it makes holiness a matter of no importance, and leads persons to be indifferent whether they do right or not. "If my opponent," said Mr. Barker, "trusted to his own righteousness instead of Christ's, he would have been more careful about what he did." Now this very objection St. Paul seemed to think might naturally be brought by ignorant or unscrupulous adversaries against the doctrine taught in the first five chapters of this Epistle. For in ch. vi. 1, he writes, "What shall we say then? *Shall we continue in sin*, that grace may abound?" And in v. 15, he again supposes the objection made, "What then? *Shall we sin*, because we are not under the law,\* but under grace?" The whole of the 6th chapter, and perhaps the 7th as well, form his reply: the drift of which is, that although the believer is dead to the law as a *covenant of works*, yet that he is not dead to it as a *rule of life*; that although he cannot have the slightest *hope* from it as regards his justification before God, and is delivered from all *fear* of it in consequence of his union with Christ by faith, yet he "delights" in it as "holy, just, and good," and therefore strives to keep it from a much higher motive than the mere escaping of punishment, or the procuring of a reward. "God forbid. How shall we, *that are dead to sin*, live any longer therein?" And if any man be *not* "dead to sin," he cannot be in Christ; for "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?"

But even this strong language, it seems, was not enough to deter some from that *abuse* and *perversion* of the doctrine, which has always given such a handle to the gainsayer. For we find from St. James, that there were persons, who *professed* to have faith, but did not bring forth the fruits of a holy life. Upon which he boldly tells them (with that utter disregard of clearing up difficulties, and avoiding apparent contradictions, which is so characteristic of the sacred writers): "that by works

\* What could be the meaning of this, if only the ceremonial law was meant? Was freedom from *that* law likely to lead any one into sin?

a man is justified and not by faith only." This sounds startling, certainly, after what we have just heard from St. Paul; who is so very explicit on our being justified by faith *without* the deeds of the law, that there is no more possibility of reconciling them by ascribing our justification to faith *and* works, than there is by confining St. Paul's meaning to the works of the ceremonial law. The explanation of the difficulty cannot be given better than in the following concise sentence of the late Rev. T. Scott; "As sinners, we are justified before God by faith in Jesus Christ: as believers, we are justified before men by the works which that faith produces." Faith justifies our *persons* before God; works justify our *profession* before men. If our profession of faith is set down by men as hypocrisy, what is to *justify* us from the charge? Our works. Or if we are accused as hypocrites by Satan at the day of judgment, what will be brought forward to *justify* us from the charge? Our works. But suppose Satan, when beaten at this point, should turn round and say, "Yes, but they have not *perfectly* kept the Divine law, and are therefore deserving of God's wrath." What could justify us from *this* charge? Why Jesus would reply, "They are mine. Believing on me they secured an interest in my perfect righteousness and atoning blood. They are thus justified from all things, and there is no condemnation for them; for according to the covenant of grace their faith is counted unto them for righteousness."

This argument of St. James's exactly agrees with St. Paul's argument in Rom. ch. vi.; only that Paul is replying to a person, who brings it as an objection against the doctrine, that it allows a believer to live in sin; while James is replying to a person, who professes to be a believer, and does live in sin. Their reply is just this; a real faith must produce works; therefore your having no works is a certain proof, that you are no believer. St. James, observe, is addressing one, who *says* he has faith: "What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man *say* he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him?" that is, can *such* a faith save him, as produces no fruits? *such* a faith, as a man without works may *say* he has? Certainly not; for a faith of this kind, which is "alone," and "hath not works" as its fruits, "is dead." The two kinds of faith, a dead faith and a living faith, the faith of the head and the faith of the heart, have been already distinguished in a former part of this lecture. A dead faith is the mere belief of a proved fact; but this in itself can do no good, for "*with the heart* man believeth unto righteousness." St. James illustrates it by the case of the devils. They have faith; that is, they believe the facts of the gospel. But their faith produces no works. Why? Because it is only a dead faith; they have never gone to Jesus in contrition of heart as *their* Saviour;

they have never received him into their hearts by a living faith: they have never accepted him as *their* anointed Prophet, Priest, and King. Of just such a nature as this must be the faith of any man who does not follow after holiness,—in other words, who has not works. On the other hand the reality of Abraham's faith, and Rahab's,\* was shewn by what it led them to do; as the reality of any true believer's faith will be shewn by the works which flow from it. "By his works," says the

\* Dr. Guyse's note on this passage may clear up the difficulty with regard to Rahab's faith. "It is evident to me, that Abraham's being justified by works could not relate to the justification of *his person* before God; because in that sense he was justified long before upon his first believing, even before he was circumcised, Rom. iv. 10, 11; nor could it relate to what some call the *secondary* justification; for this, according to them, depended upon his *finally* persevering in good works, whereas the works here specified were performed several years before his death: Nor can the other instances of Rahab's being justified by works, v. 25, relate to her own *personal* justification, with regard to her *spiritual* state: For there is not the least appearance, that this faith of hers was for justification to eternal life; or that it had any reference to Christ, or to the *types, prophecies, or promises* of him, who was the object to be believed in for a spiritual and eternal salvation; and her works were only the fruit of that faith which she had relating to *temporal* salvation, and so proved that she really did believe that *the Lord had given Israel the land* in which she dwelt, and that *he is God in heaven above and in earth below*; and this faith operated so strongly in her, as to put her upon making terms for her own and her family's safety, from the destruction that was coming upon Jericho. (See Josh. ii. 8—13.) And the writer to the Hebrews takes no notice of her justification, but only says, with a reference to the destruction of that city, *By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.* Heb. xi. 31, see the note there. But there was nothing of justifying faith in all this; no, nor in that other instance, which our apostle alledged (v. 19) of him that *believes there is one God*, which the *devils also believe and tremble*. These observations seem to lead us to an easier solution, than I have met with, of the difficulties that have been raised about reconciling this and the following verses, which speak of a man's being justified by works, and not by faith only, with the apostle Paul's doctrine of justification alone by faith without works, which he so much insisted on. Rom. iii. 28, and iv. 1—6, and Gal. ii. 16, and in several other places: For it appears by the instances which the apostle James here argues upon, that, except in the case of Abraham, it is not, so much at least, about justification by Christ, through faith in him, as about the justification of the truth and sincerity of faith in God and in his promises; which he shews to be dead, and altogether unprofitable, unless it be proved to be genuine by its practical influence upon the heart and life to all holy obedience; and so he speaks of justifying a man's faith, or his character, as a sincere believer, to free him from the charge of hypocrisy; and not of the justification of his person, to acquit him from a charge of guilt, and law-condemnation, as to his state before God, which the apostle Paul so often affirms to be by faith without works. There is therefore no real contradiction between these two apostles; since it is a quite a different sort of faith, and of justification, which they respectively speak of, and that with a view to different sorts of persons. The apostle James, to confute licentious solidians, shews that all notions and professions, even of faith in God, without good works to justify its sincerity, are vain; and the apostle Paul, to confute those self-justifiers, that were for depending on their own works, as the ground of their acceptance with God to eternal life, shews that justification in his sight, is only by faith in Christ and his righteousness, without any mixture of works, as ingredients into it; though it be not by such a faith in him, as is not productive of good works, they being inseparable from all saving faith of the operation of God."—Rahab therefore was quite a case in point, even though her faith might only refer to temporal matters; inasmuch as it proved the principle, which the apostle was contending for, namely, that no faith is any value, which does not produce a practical effect.

Apostle, "was his faith made perfect;" as the value of a tree is known by its bringing forth "fruit unto perfection." And then to shew the agreement of what he had been saying with the doctrine of imputed righteousness through faith, he quotes the very passage on which St Paul had laid so much stress, "And the Scripture was fulfilled, which said, Abraham believed God, and it was *counted unto him for righteousness.*"

Thus we see, that the doctrine of the justification of a sinner's person before God by the righteousness of Christ imputed to him on his believing, which Paul teaches, and which James warns us against *perverting*, makes holiness quite as *necessary* to salvation, as does the opposite doctrine. The difference is, that Unitarians trust to their own works for justification, while scripture teaches us, that we must first *be* justified by faith *before* we can perform any good works, and that when we *are* justified, we *shall necessarily* perform them. This is well expressed in the 11th and 12th Articles of our Church.

"We are accounted righteous before God, only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings: Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only is a most wholesome Doctrine, and very full of comfort, as more largely is expressed in the Homily of Justification."

"Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after justification, cannot put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's Judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively Faith; insomuch that by them a lively Faith may be as evidently known as a tree is discerned by the fruit."

Our Lord himself uses the simile of a tree being "known by its fruit." If it bears good fruit, it must be a good tree. But its bearing good fruit does not *make* it a good tree; it proves that it *is* one: it must *be* a good tree, *before* it can bear good fruit. Now I might either say, That bears good fruit, because it is a good tree; or, That is a good tree, because it bears good fruit. The first would mean, that the tree's being a good one was the cause of *its bearing fruit*; the second would mean, that the tree's bearing fruit was the cause of *my knowing it to be a good one*. The tree would be *justified* by its fruit; its nature, quality, and character would be *shewn*. But the tree, remember, must first have *life*, before it can produce fruit. So must we have spiritual life before we can perform spiritual acts well pleasing to God. Hear what our Lord says on this point; "As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide *in me*. I am the vine, ye are the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same

bringeth forth much fruit: *for without me ye can do nothing*." John xv 4, 5. Why can we do nothing good without Christ? Because we are all born in sin, with fallen natures. "In me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth *no good thing*." Rom. vii. 18. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, *neither indeed can be*. So then they that are in the flesh (that is, in their natural unconverted state) *cannot please God*." Rom. viii. 7, 8. Being then by nature dead branches, how are we ever to be made capable of bearing fruit? Why by being grafted into the true vine, and receiving life and nourishment from it. When a sinner believes on Christ with the heart, he becomes one with him: that vital union immediately takes place, which is here likened to the branches of a tree, in another place to the members of a body, and in virtue of which St. Paul assures us, "*Ye are complete in Him*." Col. ii. 10.

This union accomplishes two things for us. It justifies our persons before God by the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to us; and it enables us to love and serve God by the spiritual life, which is thus given us. And as our union with Christ is effected by *faith*, scripture ascribes to faith both our justification and our sanctification. Thus faith is said to work by love, Gal. v. 6; to overcome the world, 1 John v. 4; and to purify the heart, Acts xv. 9: all which effects it produces by grafting us into the true vine, and thus communicating to us spiritual life and strength. Works therefore cannot be the *cause*, but are the *necessary result*, of our justification. For the moment a sinner believes in Christ "with the heart," he believes "unto righteousness;" he is at once and for ever "justified from all things" in the sight of God. But the same union with Christ, which thus justifies him, also gives him spiritual life; and this spiritual life necessarily shews itself in acts. A body, that does not *move* in any way, cannot be alive: neither can a soul, that does not move, be alive. But the body's moving does not make it alive; it only shews that it is alive. So a soul's moving along the narrow path that leads to life does not unite it to Christ; it proves that it is united to Christ, and therefore that it is *already* justified; for unless it were so, it would be utterly dead, and incapable of the slightest spiritual motion.

After what has been already advanced, the following passages will require little comment; as they manifestly confirm the doctrine in question. "*The free gift* is of many offences unto justification." Rom. v. 16.—"What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness, have attained unto righteousness, even *the righteousness which is of faith*. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.

Wherefore? Because they sought it not by faith, but as it were by the works of the law." Rom. ix. 30—32.—"Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that *through this man* is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and *by him* all that *believe* are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses"—either moral or ceremonial; for he does not contrast moral works and ceremonial works, but the works of the law generally and *faith*. Acts xiii. 38, 39.—"We who are Jews by nature," &c., &c. Gal. ii. 15—21.—"O foolish Galatians," &c., &c. Gal. iii. 1—11.—"Is the law then against the promise of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the Scripture hath concluded *all under sin*, that the promise by *faith* of Jesus Christ might be given to them that *believe*." Gal. iii. 21, 22.—"To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us *accepted in the beloved*" Eph. i. 6.—"That I may win Christ, and be found *in him*, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, *the righteousness which is of God by faith*." Phil. iii. 9.—"By faith Noah being warned of God in things not seen as yet, moved with fear, prepared an ark to the saving of his house: by the which he condemned the world, and became heir of *the righteousness which is by faith*." Heb. xi. 7.

We shall now, I think, be able to understand the meaning of those passages of Scripture, which speak of man's works in connexion with his salvation. I cannot pretend to quote all that are brought forward against us; but I believe that among the following will be found a specimen of each kind, and that one or other of the explanations given to these, will also explain the rest.

Matt. xii. 37. "*By thy words* thou shalt be justified; and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." This means, that the general tone of a man's conversation is a sure sign of the state of his heart; "for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." The word "justified" is used in the same sense that St. James uses it.

Acts x. 34. "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons. But in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." This implies, we are told, that some work righteousness sufficiently to be accepted of God. We reply—If you mean, that they work righteousness sufficiently to be accepted *on the ground of* that righteousness, you are making Peter flatly contradict Paul's positive statements in his Epistle to the Romans, as well as his own teaching afterwards, that our "spiritual sacrifices" are "acceptable to God *by Jesus Christ*." 1 Peter, ii. 5. If you

mean, that a man may work righteousness sufficiently *to prove* his acceptance, we quite agree with you. But remember, he must be "accepted *in the beloved*"; he must be united to Christ by a living justifying faith, before he can have strength to perform any righteousness whatever. Peter had learnt from the case of Cornelius, that a *Gentile*, who showed the reality of his faith by working righteousness, was accepted by God, just as much as a *Jew*. The whole weight of our opponents' argument rests on the supposition, that Cornelius was a *heathen*! Although Peter, in the very next verse, says, "The word, which God sent unto the children of Israel, preaching *peace by Jesus Christ*; (*he is Lord of all*;) that word, I say, *ye know*." Would that every one knew the doctrine of "peace by Jesus Christ," and of his being "Lord of all," as well as Cornelius knew it.

Luke, xviii. 13, 14. "And the publican standing afar off would not lift up so much as his eyes towards heaven; but smote upon his breast saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you this man went down to his house justified rather than the other." Our Lord contrasted the Pharisee and the Publican in one particular point—self-righteousness, and a deep sense of sin. And it is just the self-righteousness of the Pharisee, and the *want* of the Publican's heartfelt conviction of his own utter unworthiness, that keeps sinners from applying to the Great Physician, from laying hold of the only hope set before them, from plunging into the "fountain opened for sin and uncleanness." If you mean to say, that nothing more is necessary for justification, than man's smiting upon his breast, and saying, God be merciful to me a sinner, you overthrow your own doctrine just as much as our's. That would make not only faith, *but also works*, unnecessary to justification. Oh! but, you say, if he was really a humbled sinner, he would be sure to endeavour to serve God for the future. Undoubtedly he would. And if he was a humbled sinner, he would be sure to rest upon the promised Saviour with a living faith, and accept God's mercy *just as it was offered him*. Christ here shews us one essential mark of a true believer; without which we can have no real justifying faith.

Rom. ii. 13. "For not the hearers of the law are just before God; but the doers of the law shall be justified." This occurs in the very midst of the argument, by which St Paul is proving that no one can be justified by his own works, because neither Jew nor Gentile have perfectly kept the law. And noting short of this perfect righteousness, he argues, could justify any man before God *on the ground of his own doings*, for not the *hearers* of the law are just before God, but the *doers* of the law\*.

\* Does this mean the ceremonial law.



shall be justified." Just on the same principle our Lord answers the young ruler, as will be seen by turning to

Matt. xix. 16. "And behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God: but if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." This man came in a self-righteous spirit, bent upon earning heaven by doing some "good thing." And he was "answered according to his idols." If a person is to merit eternal life by his own doings, keeping the commandments is certainly the way, and the only way. But remember, he must keep them *perfectly*; "for the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* unrighteousness," and "not the hearers, but the *doers* of the law shall be justified." This was what Jesus wanted to convince the ruler of; and he led the conversation on to that precise point, which exposed his weakness, and made even himself feel, that he at least could not boast of such a perfect righteousness as alone would have entitled him to eternal life. How different the answer of Paul and Silas to the Philippian jailor's question, "What shall I do to be saved? And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved." Such in substance would no doubt have been Christ's answer to the young ruler, if he had asked the question in the same spirit, and felt the same need of being "*saved*."

Micah vi. 8. "He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." But "going about to establish their own righteousness," and refusing to "submit themselves to the righteousness of God" is surely not "walking *humbly* with their God." Nor can the setting up of man's reason against God's revealed word, be properly called "walking humbly with God."

Eccl. xii. 13. "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter. Fear God and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man." Perhaps the Jews had this text in view, when they asked Jesus, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, *that ye believe on him whom he hath sent*." John vi. 28. We must be united to Christ by faith before we can keep any of God's commandments spiritually, or do any good works. When that union has taken place, the rest *must* follow.

Rom. ii. 6. "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them, who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, honour, and immortality, eternal life." The remarks on the two last passages, apply also to this. No *sinner* can do anything "well," until he is grafted by faith

into the true vine: nor would it be "well doing" to seek for "glory, honour, and immortality" *in any other than God's appointed way*, namely, "through faith in" Christ's "blood."

Luke iv. 7. "I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." If by this our Lord meant to say, as is contended, that there are some persons who have nothing to repent of; St. Paul's writings, to go no farther, must be a mass of heresy. For he there asserts, and on the authority of the Old Testament, that there is none righteous, no, not one; that "there is *no difference*, for *all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." But we need say no more on this point. Every one must see the impossibility of that being Christ's meaning. There are two interpretations given of his words: one, that he spoke of persons, who did not feel their need of repentance; the other, that by repentance, he meant the sinner's first turning from darkness to light, and therefore spoke of persons already converted. Such would not need "a change of mind," which is the literal meaning of "repentance" in the original; but they would have need of continual penitence and contrition of heart, not only for their past sins, but also for their daily transgressions.—In the same way, when Jesus says "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance," he may either mean the self-righteous, or those who have already "attained to the righteousness of faith."

Luke vii. 47. "Her sins which are many are forgiven; *for she loved much.*" Did her love then procure her forgiveness? No; for a sinner never can love God, until he has been made to feel God's forgiving love towards him: "We love him because he first loved us." 1 John iv. 19. Her love *flowed from her sense* of forgiveness, and *shewed* that she *was* forgiven. How she obtained forgiveness Jesus immediately declares, by saying to her, "Thy *faith* hath saved thee: go in peace."

Rev. xxii. 14. "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city." It is rather singular, that this passage is found in a book denounced by some as an orthodox forgery: and yet it has a more unorthodox *sound*, than perhaps any other text in the whole Bible: so much so, that it is very improbable, that any orthodox writer, unless he was inspired, would have ventured upon such an expression. But the question is, *How* does our obedience give us the right of admission into the heavenly city? Imagine a place, into which none but members of the Royal family were admitted. When any one appeared at the gate demanding admission, he was required to produce a *certificate* of his

belonging to the Royal family. You might very properly say "Blessed is he, that has the certificate, that he may have right to enter through the gates." But how would the certificate give a right of admission? Simply by *proving* his right. The actual right rested upon other grounds; namely, his being a member of the Royal family. So good works are the certificate or proof of our belonging to Christ's family, of our having an interest in his death and righteousness, which is the sinner's only true title to eternal life. And blessed indeed is he, that can prove his title by a hearty obedience to God's commandments, that he may have right to the tree of life.

Ez. xviii. 5—9. "If a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, \* \* \* he is just, he shall surely live." That is, if a man *act* justly, it proves that he *is* just in the sight of God, and *therefore* shall surely live." But only "*the just by faith* shall live."

Ez. xviii. "Because he considereth, and turneth from all his transgressions that he hath committed, he shall surely live, he shall not die." If you mean to contend from this, that repentance is the sole means of procuring pardon, you at once place yourself in direct opposition to a host of other texts, which have been already referred to. If you only mean, that repentance necessarily accompanies true faith, we perfectly agree with you. But can those be said to "turn from all their transgressions," who remain guilty of the greatest of all transgressions—unbelief?

Matt. vi. 9. "After this manner therefore pray ye, &c., &c." The objection drawn from this prayer lies mainly against our making Christ's merits and death a ground of trust or confidence before God; as Christ's name is not mentioned in it. But this apparent want is fully supplied in the very title by which we are here taught to address God—"Our Father." If we were holy creatures, it would be enough for us to look up to him as our Creator; and in so doing we should enjoy all the privileges, and feelings, of his children. But sin has robbed us of that; it has driven us out of our Father's family, and alienated our hearts from him. We are not therefore now *naturally* his children; for we are "*by nature* the children of wrath, even as others." How then are we to become his children? How are we to regain the privileges and feelings, which our first parents lost; so that we may be able to look up to God with the spirit of adoption, and say Our Father? Scripture tells us—by faith in his Son Jesus Christ. "To as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." John i. 12. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Gal. iii. 26. "When the fulness of time was come, God sent

forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that ye might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. iv. 4—6. Therefore, although Christ's *name* is not mentioned in this prayer, yet we are taught, by calling God "Our Father," to approach him as his "children by faith in Jesus Christ." And unless we do thus approach him, our prayer can never reach his ears; for Jesus himself said, "No man cometh unto the Father, *but by me*"; and again, "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father *in my name*, he will give it you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive, that your joy may be full." John xvi. 23. "*In whom* we may have boldness and *access* with confidence by the faith of him." Eph. iii. 12. "Seeing then that we have a great High Priest, that is passed into the heaven, Jesus, the Son of God; let us hold fast our profession. For we have not an High Priest, which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us *therefore* come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need." Heb. iv. 14—16. "Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest *by the blood of Jesus*, by a new and living way which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having an High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Heb. x. 19—22.

I John iii. 21, 22. "Beloved, if our heart condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God. And whatsoever we ask, we receive of him, because we keep his commandments, and do those things that are pleasing in his sight." This is just such a passage as some that have already been noticed; but as considerable stress is laid on it, I thought it better not to omit mentioning it. The question is, *How* does our obedience give us confidence before God? It cannot be on the ground of its own merit; because, in this very Epistle, St. John says "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us"; and no imperfect obedience can be a ground of confidence before a just and holy God, "who is of purer eyes, than to behold iniquity." It can only give us confidence, in the same way that it can give us "right to the tree of life," namely, by proving our interest in, and union with, Christ. And that this is St. John's meaning, is evident from what he says just before: "*We know* that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren. \* \* \* And hereby *we know*, that we are of the truth, and shall assure

our hearts before him." The words, which immediately follow the text in question, are also to be noted: "And *this* is his commandment, *that we believe on the name of his Son Jesus Christ*, and love one another, as he gave us commandment." Now no one can believe in Jesus scripturally, who has any confidence in his own merits; nor can any one do "that which is well-pleasing in God's sight," who goes about to establish his own righteousness, and refuses to *submit* to the righteousness of God.

Gen. iv. 7. "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin (that is a *sin offering*) lieth at the door." God had ordained an *animal* to be slain in sacrifice, as typical of the real sin-offering which was to be made for the sins of the world. But Cain in unbelief despised this ordinance of God, and chose rather to offer fruit to the Lord. If Cain had been a sinless being, it would have been a much fitter offering to the Lord, than a slain animal. But he was not; and God began thus early to teach the ruined children of Adam the all-important doctrine, that "without shedding of blood is no remission":—his offering was rejected. On Cain's shewing signs of displeasure God expostulates with him; "If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted?" If you were perfectly upright and without sin, *any thing* you offered would be accepted for your own sake: but if your conscience tells you, that you cannot boast of such a perfect obedience, as alone could entitle your service to acceptance with one who "is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity," why should you reject the salvation offered you as a sinner, through the shedding of blood? Or why should you despise the appointed mode of expressing your faith in that atonement—sacrifice? "If thou doest not well, a sin offering lieth at the door." There could be no difficulty in procuring a proper animal for sacrifice.—This is just what we would say to the Unitarian. If you do well, most certainly you will be accepted. But if you do not well, (and remember "there is no difference; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," "there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not," "In many things we offend all," and "if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves")—if you do not well, perfectly and unceasingly, without the smallest failure in thought, word, or deed, then beware of approaching your Maker, except through that only "name given amongst men" whereby *sinner*s can be saved. And remember further, that "heresy" is *not* doing well, but is amongst the works of the flesh, which they who do "shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven."

Matt. vii. 24—27. "Therefore whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, &c." This is thought to prove, that our own doings are the rock on which we are to build our hopes of heaven. But Paul says "other foundation

can no man lay, than that is laid, *which is Jesus Christ.*" 1 Cor. ix. 11. And then he speaks of good works being built *upon* that foundation. And this is what our Lord meant. The man who obeyed his words, shewed that he had a *living* saving faith in him, and therefore that his house was built upon the rock; while the man, who obeyed them not, showed that his was a *dead* faith, which cannot unite a sinner to Christ, and therefore his hopes of Salvation would be disappointed.

Mark xi. 25, 26. "And when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any; that your Father also, which is in heaven, may forgive you your trespasses. But if ye do not forgive, neither will your Father, which is in heaven, forgive your trespasses." God has solemnly declared, that he will not forgive those, who do not forgive one another. We are therefore consistently told to forgive, that we *may* be forgiven; inasmuch as otherwise we *could not* be forgiven. "If any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." An unforgiving spirit therefore would prove us to be none of Christ's, and thus exclude us from pardon: while a forgiving spirit proves, that we "are in Christ Jesus," ("for without me ye can do nothing,") and that "there is therefore now no condemnation for us."

Other passages of a similar kind might be mentioned; but as the same principle applies to them all, we need not occupy any further time with them. Let me just draw your attention, before concluding, to three figurative allusions to the doctrine of imputed righteousness; which are not brought forward, observe, to prove anything, but to illustrate what has been already proved. They are the following:

Gen. iii. 21. "Unto Adam also, and to his wife, did the Lord God make coats of skin, and clothed them." We have before shewn that these were the skins of animals, which had been *sacrificed*, to typify the "one sacrifice for sins" offered by Jesus on the cross. Adam and Eve having sinned "knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons." These however would be but a very imperfect covering for them; and so the Lord God made them coats of the skins of the sacrifices, and covered them. "Which things are an allegory." They represent the sinner convinced of sin, but as yet "ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish his own righteousness," patching up an apron of fig-leaves to hide the nakedness he is ashamed of: until the Holy Spirit shews him a real covering, *which the Lord God has made for him*, even the perfect righteousness of Christ, and enables him by faith to clothe himself with it. Reader! which is your covering? The apron of fig-leaves made by yourself; or the coat of skins which "the Lord God did make"?

Matt. xiii. 45, 46. "Again, the kingdom of heaven is like unto a merchant-man, seeking goodly pearls: who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had, and bought it." Jewels are well known scriptural emblems of righteousness or good works. This merchant-man then is one, who is seeking to enrich himself spiritually by his own good works. And this trade, we are told, he continues, until he unexpectedly meets with something that puts a stop to it. He finds one pearl of such immense value, that in order to obtain it he is obliged to sell all his present stock, to part with every single pearl he possesses! But it is worth his while; for if he can get it, the whole object of his life will be attained—his fortune made at once and for ever. What then is this one pearl of great price, which is worth so much more than all the rest he had been able to put together? It is clear, by being called a pearl, that it must be something of the same kind as the good pearls he had been seeking all along, only more valuable in quality. Well, we saw that they meant righteousness or good works. The one pearl of great price therefore must be some righteousness, far more valuable than any thing of his own, which he cannot obtain without giving up all his own; but which, when obtained, fulfils his most earnest desires, gives him, what he has so long been seeking for in vain, peace of conscience and acceptance before God. And what can this be, but the perfect righteousness of Christ, which is imputed to the sinner on his believing; the wedding garment put on by faith, which covers him from head to foot, and arrayed in which he stands before God as pure and spotless as if he had never sinned? It is true this wedding robe cannot be *bought*; but still the resemblance even in this point is striking! For the sinner must *give up* all his fancied righteousness, he must renounce all idea of any merit in himself, before he can put on Christ. If it be asked, why the righteousness of Christ is compared to a pearl, rather than other more valuable jewels, a diamond for instance,—we reply, because a diamond owes its form and beauty to the art of man: it has to be cut and ground before it can shine so beautifully. Not so the pearl. It leaves the shell perfect; nothing, that man can do, can make it more beautiful or valuable. It is set in the Queen's diadem, just as it comes out of its shell.\*

This parable shews us, the connection between the Law and the Gospel. It is the Law which makes the man a merchant, which sets him to seek goodly pearls. Its language is "Do this and live"; "The man that doeth these things shall live by them"; "If thou wilt enter into life keep the commandments." He therefore begins seeking; but he can find nothing

\* Many other interesting points of resemblance are shewn in a little tract called "The pearl of great price," published at Hull by W. L. Anderson.

that will do; all the pearls he can meet with have flaws in them; he cannot produce even one, that is perfect. Then the Gospel comes in and offers him what he is seeking for, namely, a perfect righteousness which will satisfy God, the one pearl of great price, a pearl in which the strict law of God can find no flaw. Thus "the law is our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." It creates the want, which the gospel supplies. It sets us on seeking pearls, and it shews us the worthlessness of all we have been able to find, that we may be ready to accept with joy, and properly to value, the one pearl, when it is presented to us in the gospel. The law is righteousness required, the gospel is righteousness revealed. The law is the seeking of pearls, the gospel is the one pearl found.

Matt. xxii. 12. "And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless." Did it never strike you as being rather remarkable, that *any* of the guests should have had wedding garments, or that the single exception should have been speechless, when asked why he appeared without one? Surely he might have given a very good reason. The king's servants had gone out, and brought in any one they could find on the highway "both bad and good," to sit down to the marriage feast at a moment's notice. How could they be expected to have wedding dresses on? Or what time was there to go and get them; even supposing they could all have afforded it? This difficulty is at once removed, by reference to the eastern custom of providing wedding dresses for the guests at the house where the entertainment was given. Each guest, on his arrival, put off his own upper garment, which was a long loose robe, and put on one provided for the purpose. No matter how gay or splendid a person's own dress may be, he must leave it behind him; for he can only be admitted in *the wedding garment*. This person then, though brought in straight from the highway, must have *refused* the garment offered him at the king's palace, and chosen rather to appear in his own dress. Whatever his motive might be,—whether it was from sheer carelessness, or from pride because he thought his own dress good enough—when confronted with the king, and asked the cause of his thus appearing, "he was speechless." What is this parable meant to teach us? Evidently two things. 1. None, who hear the gospel invitation to "the marriage supper of the Lamb," need be afraid of accepting it because of their own unworthiness; for the wedding robe of Christ's righteousness is ready for them all, "without money and without price." They have only to put it on by faith, and then they may appear with acceptance before the King of Kings. It is a perfect and complete covering for the most "poor and blind and



naked and miserable," like that literal robe, for which the soldiers cast lots, "without seam, woven from the top throughout." 2. None, who wish to be admitted at the marriage supper, must dare to appear in their own dress, however excellent they may fancy it. Only one dress is allowed in the King's presence, and before that can be put on, their own dress must be put off. The sinner must renounce all trust in his own righteousness, before he can be clothed in Christ's righteousness: and unless he does so, however careless or self-confident he may be now, he will assuredly be speechless at the day of judgment.

Dear brethren, "to you is the word of salvation sent." "Here is a righteousness for you all, so pure, so perfect, that a martyr's best blood would defile it, and a saint's purest tear would blemish and bedim it—a righteousness which can receive no addition from man, and no deterioration from devils; nothing that earth can do can add to its splendour; and nothing that Satan can effect can depreciate its worth. The eye that detects spots in the azure heavens, and infirmities in the burning cherubim, sees no flaw in this garment. Arrayed in it, you stand before the Holy One, "without spot, or blemish, or any such thing." It was woven by the fingers, washed in the blood, sprinkled with the tears, and perfumed by the merits of God's incarnate Son. It is free. It is given to every guilty sinner that seeks it from Christ, without money and without price."\*

Some year ago, a disastrous shipwreck having occurred off the southern coast of England, a clergyman in the neighbourhood, took occasion in his sermon on the following Sunday, to make some particular reflections on the circumstance. He supposed a man just about to sink under the waves catching sight of a plank within reach of him. With what eager anxiety does he lay hold of it, to try whether it will bear him! With what delight he finds, that it *does* bear him! How firmly he clings to it, till it has landed him safely on the shore! The preacher then applied this to the case of a perishing sinner, whose eyes the Spirit had opened to see the way of salvation through a crucified Saviour. He exhorted all present to seek that Saviour. He set before them the atoning blood, and justifying righteousness, of Jesus Christ, and entreated them to cast themselves at the foot of the cross as helpless guilty sinners, that they might be cleansed from all their sins in his precious blood. He invited them to rest their whole weight upon Him, who was able and willing to bear them safely to land.—Time passed on: nothing particular was ever said to him about this sermon, until one day he received a message

from a neighbouring parish, that a dying man was most anxious to see him. He never remembered seeing the man, or having heard his name before; but the message was so pressing, that he immediately went. On entering the room, he perceived by his manner, that the man at once recognised him, and attempted to speak; but his strength was so far gone, that he was unable to make himself heard. His wife then told the clergyman, that a remarkable effect had been produced upon her husband by a sermon, which he had heard him preach some time ago: that he had often since been desirous to see him, but had never had an opportunity. The clergyman, seeing him to be at the point of death, leant over his bed, to catch if possible any thing which he might be able to utter even in a whisper. After a short pause, the sick man appeared to gather up his remaining strength for a last effort, just gasped into his ear, *The plank bears*—and died.

May this blessed experience be yours and mine, whether we have to "pass through the valley of the shadow of death," or whether we "are alive and remain" until the coming of our Lord. May each one of us be enabled to say with the confidence of St. Paul, "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day" 2 Tim. i. 12.

## LECTURE XV.

### GOOD AND EVIL SPIRITS.

"For the Sadducees say, that there is \* \* \* neither angel nor spirit."—Acts xxiii. 8.

OUR Lectures have hitherto formed a continuous chain of argument, all tending to furnish the full scriptural answer to that important question, "What must I do to be saved?" With the preceding Lecture, therefore, our subject, strictly speaking, concluded; and it was, in fact, the last of the course, which was delivered from the pulpit. But in sending them to the press, I cannot pass over two doctrines, against which infidelity is very busy just now in aiming her shafts;—The Existence of the Devil; and The Obligation of the Sabbath. The former will be the subject of the present Lecture.

I scarcely know what is the general opinion of Unitarians in the present day with regard to spiritual agency; but the fathers of modern Unitarianism in the last century, most certainly denied, either the existence of Angels and Devils at all, or at least their having anything to do with our concerns. If we may judge from his speaking of "the most orthodox devil ever believed in," Mr. Barker would seem to disbelieve Satan's existence at all events, whatever he may think of Angels. Both good and evil spirits however, especially the latter, are very favourite subjects of ridicule in the theological discussions, which are so customary in many of the workshops of this neighbourhood. It may be well, therefore, to notice them together; the argument in both cases being the same.

But let it be observed, that we are not arguing with the avowed Deist, who merely scoffs at the doctrine, without pretending to reconcile his opinions and scripture together; but with one, who does admit an appeal to scripture, and contends that the existence of such beings, as we are speaking of, is not taught there. We have therefore nothing to do with such questions as, *How* can spirits do this? or *how* can they do that? but simply with the question, What saith the scripture? If God's word says that there *are* such beings, and that they *do* interfere in the affairs of this world, we know that it *must be* true, however unaccountable it may appear to us. As for myself, I must confess, that I can neither see any difficulty,

T

nor even improbability, in the fact: but surely those who do, ought not to require reminding, that "what is impossible with man is possible with God; for with God *all things* are possible."

The way in which Unitarians explain away the constant mention of spirits in the Old and New Testaments, is by saying, that all such expressions are merely instances of the high-flown figurative language so common in the east. They only regard them therefore as allusions to fictitious personages, or personifications of certain principles, virtues, and vices. When a man is assisted by an angel, it only means that good thoughts are rising within him; when he is tempted by the devil, that evil thoughts are rising within him. The following extract from Rowland Hill's Village Dialogues may be thought rather an extreme instance of Solomon's maxim "Answer a fool according to his folly"; but I don't see how it can well be condemned, without also condemning Elijah's mockery of the not one whit more rational or scriptural doctrines of the Priests of Baal.

"*Considerate.* Allow me then, Sir, to ask you this plain question, If we are to be guided alone by our reason, while we are at liberty to doubt every word of revelation, are we to call this Infidelity or Christianity? or is not Deism far more rational and consistent than such sort of Christianity?

"*Wisehead.* O, sir, we are still believers in the Christian religion.

"*Considerate.* Why then, Christian believers are at liberty to doubt the certainty of every truth of Revelation itself; even Jews and Mohammedans believe a part of the Bible, but deny the rest. I beg leave, therefore, further to ask, if this be Christianity, what is Infidelity?

"*Wisehead.* Sir, the question is easily answered; some few infidels doubt, whether there ever was such a person as Jesus Christ, and others of them think there is no future state; but we all believe there will be a future state, and that there is such a person as Jesus, the son of Mary; but then we do not conceive ourselves bound to believe the story of his miraculous conception, or his pre-existence, as it is called, or the strange inconsistent mysterious doctrine of the Trinity; and, among other "corruptions of Christianity," contrary to what we esteem the rational and "the true Gospel of Christ," we reject what is commonly called the doctrine of the atonement: "in every shape, and under every modification of it, it is unfounded in the Christian revelation." Nor can we believe, that there is any such a being as the Holy Spirit. Consequently we have nothing to do with the abstruse notion of regeneration, or, as it is called, the work of the Spirit; we believe, that such sort of expressions are to be taken as *oriental figures*, or as "tropical language;" and, that it only means a

good disposition. We, therefore, consequently, deny the popular doctrine of original sin, as there is quite as much virtue as vice in the world; and, we have no doubt at all, as to the devil, that he is entirely a fabulous character, and as to what is said concerning those who were possessed of the devil, it were irrational to suppose, that it could mean any thing further than that "they were mad or had hysteric fits;" and as to the existence of angels, "though there are *frequent allusions* to it in the New Testament," yet it is "a doctrine that *cannot be proved or made probable FROM THE LIGHT OF NATURE*;" and, what have we got to do with the New Testament, while it contradicts the light of nature? Notwithstanding, therefore, the *allusion*, we chuse to say, "this is no where taught as a doctrine of revelation. A judicious Christian, therefore, will discard it from his creed; and, that, not only as a groundless, but as a useless and pernicious tenet, which tends to diminish our regard to the omniscient, and omnipresent God, and to excite superstitious respect to, and unreasonable expectations from, imaginary and fictitious beings; when therefore, we hear how Jesus was tempted of the devil in the wilderness; it was, (for we always talk very rationally in our way,) only an *allusion to a fictitious being*; and the proper and most rational meaning is, that he was fighting with some good and bad thoughts which alternately possessed him; but such were the Eastern metaphors and Oriental figures then in use.

"*Considerate.* Then, sir, might it not have sounded still more *rational* had you made it out that he was fighting with two Eastern metaphors or Oriental figures? that when the angel spoke to Zecharias about the birth of John, the fore-runner of our Lord, he should not have said, "I am Gabriel," but "I am an Oriental figure?" and that it was nothing but an Oriental figure that spoke to Mary on the same subject? and that Eastern metaphors or Oriental figures appeared unto the shepherds, and sung "Glory to God in the highest, on earth peace, good will toward men;" and then again, that our Lord had another meeting of these Eastern metaphors and Oriental figures in the mount of transfiguration? that an Eastern metaphor opened the prison in which Peter was confined, and that an Oriental figure knocked off his fetters? that Paul was converted at the sight of these Eastern metaphors? that Stephen saw somewhat of the like sort before he was stoned? and that an Eastern metaphor stood by Paul when near shipwrecked? And if these be not enough, I could give you some further lucubrations on your *rational* way of explaining these Eastern metaphors."

It may be asked, what practical difference does it make, whether we understand those passages, which speak of good and evil spirits interfering in human affairs, in a literal or

figurative sense? We answer, 1. If God has seen fit to reveal the fact of their personal agency, he must have intended the knowledge of that fact to be of some use to us: by disbelieving or neglecting it, therefore, we must lose that benefit; besides being guilty of direct infidelity. 2. If such interpretations of scripture can be admitted, as are required to support the figurative view of these statements, we may just as well throw the Bible away at once; for a more dark, useless, unmeaning book, on this principle, was never written. There is not one single fact or doctrine of any kind whatever, that could be proved by it. I challenge the disbeliever in the personality of Satan, to prove from scripture, that there ever were such persons as Peter, Paul, John, Herod, Pontius Pilate, or Jesus Christ;\* that there is any resurrection of the dead, any future state, or any judgment to come, at which we shall have to give account of the deeds done in the body. Nay, I challenge him to prove from scripture *the existence of God!* And I should be quite willing to rest the whole case on this one point. Prove to me from scripture, that God is a real person, and not a figurative representation of certain principles and powers; and I will prove to you, that angels and devils are real persons. Bring forward, if you can, one single argument against *their* existence, which an atheist might not quite as justly bring against *God's* existence. Tell us, why one who disbelieves the personality of God may not believe the Bible, just as much as one who disbelieves the personality of Satan. Is one declared an iota more pointedly than the other? I suppose you will allow the first verse in Genesis to be about as strong a declaration of God's personal agency as could well be made:—"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." But how could you bring this against a person holding the doctrine of Lucretius, for instance? He believed that the world came into existence by a sort of accidental meeting of certain powers of nature: and why, on your principle, might not "God," in this verse, be "a fictitious personage," personifying that occurrence? You would perhaps tell him, that "to create" means to make *out of nothing*: but he could easily reply, that it was *irrational* to believe such an impossibility as that the world could be made out of nothing; and that "created," in this verse, must also be taken *figuratively*. What answer could you give that would not be just as conclusive against your own unbelief of angelic and Satanic agency? Let us turn to a few passages of Scripture, that you may be able to judge whether this is at all an exaggerated comparison; and whether with any show of reason you can pretend to believe the Bible, and yet deny such plainly revealed truths, as those we are speaking of.

\* The German Rationalists have carried the principle out; and contend that Jesus Christ is only "a fictitious personage," representing certain Divine truths.

To begin with ANGELS.

"And the angel of the Lord appeared unto her, and said, Behold now thou art barren. \* \* \* Then the woman came and told her husband, Behold a man of God came unto me, and his countenance was like the countenance of an angel of God. \* \* \* For it came to pass, when the flame went up toward heaven from off the altar, that the angel of the Lord ascended in the flame of the altar." Judges, ch. xiii. A spirit being invisible to our bodily eyes, we find that whenever an angel appeared to any one, he generally appeared in human form as a man; but with something sufficiently remarkable about him to shew what he was. If this circumstance were a dream, or the effects of a heated imagination, it is rather strange that they should both fancy exactly the same thing; that the woman should first fancy it, and then, on calling her husband to the spot, that he should fancy it too!—"And when the angel stretched out his hand upon Jerusalem to destroy it, the Lord repented him of the evil, and said to the angel that destroyed the people, It is enough: stay now thine hand. And the angel of the Lord was by the threshing-place of Araunah the Jebusite." 2 Sam. xxiv. 16.—"And as he lay and slept under a juniper tree, behold, then an angel touched him, and said unto him, Arise and eat." 1 Kings xix. 5.—"And the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness, by the fountain in the way to Shur. And he said, Hagar, Sarah's maid," &c. Gen. xvi. 7.—"Balaam saw the angel of the Lord in the way." &c., &c. Num. xxii. 31.—"And then came an angel of the Lord, and sat under an oak. \* \* \* And the angel of the Lord appeared to him, and said unto him. \* \* \* Then the angel of the Lord put forth the end of the staff that was in his hand, and touched the flesh and the unleavened cakes: and there rose up fire out of the rock, and consumed the unleavened cakes. Then the angel of the Lord departed out of his sight." Judges vi. 11—14.—"And it came to pass that night, that the angel of the Lord went out, and smote in the camp of the Assyrians an hundred fourscore and five thousand; and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses." 2 Kings xix. 35.

But we need not multiply passages from the Old Testament; as any one may find them for himself to any extent, by turning to a concordance. Let us see, whether the same thing be not as plainly taught in the New Testament, for which some persons profess a much greater respect.

"And behold there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men,

And the angel answered and said unto the women, &c." Matt. xxviii. 2—5.—"And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord standing on the right side of the altar of incense. And when Zacharias saw him, he was troubled, and fear fell upon him. But the angel said unto him \* \* \* And in the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from God unto a city of Galilee, named Nazareth, to a virgin espoused to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David; and the virgin's name was Mary. And the angel came in unto her, and said, &c." Luke i. 11—35.—"And, lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them; and they were sore afraid. And the angel said unto them, Fear not \* \* \* And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host, praising God, and saying, &c." Luke ii. 9.—"And there appeared an angel unto him from heaven, strengthening him." Luke xxii. 43.—"And, behold, angels came and ministered unto him." Matt. iv. 11.—"The reapers are the angels." Matt. xiii. 39.—"No, not the angels in heaven." Matt. xxiv. 36.—"And all the holy angels with him." Matt. xxv. 31.—"Think ye, that I cannot now pray to my Father in heaven, and he should presently send me more than twelve legions of angels?" Matt. xxvi. 53.—"And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive." Luke xxiv. 23.—"And as she wept, and stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre, she seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain. And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou?"—John xx. 12.—"He saw in a vision evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming unto him, and saying unto him \* \* \* And when the angel, which spake to Cornelius, was departed," &c. Acts x. 3.—"And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him, and a light shined in the prison; and he smote Peter on the side, and raised him up, saying, Arise up quickly. And the chains fell off from his hands, &c. &c." Acts. xii. 8.—"For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, saying, Fear not, Paul." Acts xxvii. 23.—"But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth, and said, &c." Acts v. 19.—"And the angel of the Lord spake to Philip, saying, Arise." Acts viii. 26.—"We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men." 1 Cor. iv. 9.—"Know ye not, that we shall judge angels?" 1 Cor. vi. 3.—"When the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels!" 2 Thes. i. 7.—"And let all the angels of God worship him. And of the angels he saith, Who maketh his angels spirits, and his



ministers a flame of fire \* \* \* But to which of the angels said he at any time, sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool? Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. i. 6—14.—"Be not forgetful to entertain strangers; for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." Heb. xiii. 2.—"For verily he took not on him the nature of angels, but he took on him the seed of Abraham." Heb. ii. 16.—"Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might, bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord." 2 Peter ii. 11.—"Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Jude ix.

Such are some of the "allusions" in the New Testament to the ministry of angels. The following observations from the pen of the late highly gifted Charlotte Elizabeth will be a useful introduction to our Scripture references with regard to *evil* spirits.

"Before proceeding to examine the truth concerning Satan, we must notice the false impressions current both as to his person and employment. We are taught from the nursery to regard him as a hideous, disgusting, and almost ludicrously contemptible object. A black, mis-shapen, half-human body, with limbs and other appendages belonging to various classes of animals; an excessively frightful, grinning face; and, in short, a preposterous compound of all that is ugly and incongruous, supply the general idea of the 'Prince of this world.' This fabulous image bears the marks of his own creation, for it is calculated to throw us off our guard by masking his real importance; so that we grow up ashamed of having once been frightened by these pictures of the devil, and count it a mark of matured reason to laugh at the hobgoblin of our childhood. His name, too, is linked with mean and ridiculous associations; it is denounced as a vulgarism, and when plainly uttered in conversation with a reference to his works, a smile of levity, if not a grave reproof, usually awaits the offender. A variety of nicknames have been applied to him, the substitution of which for his scriptural title is considered as showing greater respect for the auditors and greater refinement in the speaker; and he has been so identified with the most flippant, most trifling or profane forms of speech, even among polished gentlemen, that one of the hardest tasks the awakened Christian has to encounter is, to disconnect the name of the devil from such associations, and to dissuade others from so offending.\*

\* Equally absurd are the common representations of angels, as little children with nothing but heads and wings. Such was not the angel who slew 185,000 Assyrians in one night; nor such the "mighty angels," which will attend our Lord's triumphant return to earth.

“As regards his works a still more dangerous mistake seems to prevail: he is looked on by the professing world in general as little more than a chimerical personage; one who, when our Lord was upon earth, proved busy and troublesome to him, but who is mostly in hell, tormenting such as he has got into his power, and rarely, if ever, interfering with the course of this world. Sometimes the most petty annoyances, and vexatious little mistakes are referred to his mischievous arrangements, but more through momentary petulance than any sober conviction: at other times he is represented as presiding where very extensive injury is done; perhaps directing the campaigns of a Napoleon, or baffling some scheme of universal philanthropy. But to regard him as systematically busying himself in the concerns of individuals, more particularly as influencing, by his artful suggestions, their words and deeds, is looked on as most childish superstitious. Nay, even among spiritual persons there is a lurking unbelief on this subject, which gives the enemy many an advantage over them. They are loth to admit that, when engaged in promoting a good work, Satan is at their right hand, resisting them: that, by his whispered suggestions, their humility is often depressed into cowardice, their zeal quickened into rashness, their confidence urged on to presumption, and their prudence chilled into unbelief. In whatsoever quality the Lord has enabled them to excel, of that very excellence Satan will weave a snare for their feet; and the snare once laid, he has abundant agencies at work to draw or drive them into it. Theoretically, perhaps, this is not denied; but point out a living instance of such delusion, and you are presently reprovèd or frowned into silence.”\*

It may also be necessary to observe, that, as the holy angels act under the immediate direction of God, so the fallen angels seem to obey the commands of one great master mind amongst them, who is their Prince and Leader. When, therefore, we read of anything being done by “Satan,” “Beelzebub,” “the devil,” “the adversary,” &c., &c., it is not necessary to understand that he does it in person; but that it is done by one of “his angels,” acting under his direction: just as things are often said to be done by God which are done by *his* angels. As Scripture, however, generally attributes whatever evil is done by spiritual agency to Satan himself, we usually follow the same mode of expression, and speak as if there were but *one* devil; which has given rise to the infidel cavil, that it is impossible for the devil to be tempting many people at the same time. We need only remind such objectors of the evil spirit’s own words, “Our name is Legion, for we are many.”

\* *Principalities and Powers.*

"And the Lord God said unto the serpent, Because thou has done this," &c. Gen. iii. 14. Let any one read this chapter, and say what reason he can give for believing the God mentioned in it to be a real person any more than the serpent mentioned, which we are told by Paul (2 Cor. ii. 3), and by John (Rev. xx. 2) was the devil appearing in the form of a serpent.—"And Satan stood up against Israel and provoked David to number the people." 1 Chron. xxi. 1.—"Now there was a day when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, and Satan came also among them. And the Lord said unto Satan, Whence comest thou?" &c., &c. Job. i. 6—12.—"Let Satan stand at his right hand." Psalm cix. 6.—"And he shewed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand, to resist him. And the Lord said unto Satan, The Lord rebuke thee, O Satan." Zech. iii. 1, 2.

The prominent notice of devils in the New Testament is in the numerous instances of persons possessed by them, whom Jesus delivered from their power. Unitarians contend, that being possessed by a devil only meant being diseased or lunatic. But St. Matthew's words in ch. iv. 24 are decisive against any such a notion: for he mentions lunatics, and diseased persons, *as well as* those possessed with devils; "and they brought unto him all sick people that were taken with divers diseases and torments, *and* those which were possessed with devils, *and* those which were lunatic, and those that had the palsy; and he healed them." Besides, the scenes which took place with them, are utterly irreconcilable with the idea of persons being only afflicted with madness, as will presently be seen. The cases are far too numerous to mention them all. We will select one or two of the most striking. "Then was brought unto him one possessed with a devil, blind, and dumb: and he healed him, insomuch that the blind and dumb both spake and saw. And all the people were amazed, and said, Is not this the son of David? But when the Pharisees heard it, they said, This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils. And Jesus knew their thoughts, and said unto them, Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand? And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your children cast them out? therefore they shall be your judges. But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the kingdom of God is come unto you. Or else how can one enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he first bind the strong man? and then he will spoil his house." Matt.

xii. 22—29. It would really be hopeless to argue with any one, who could attempt to explain away such words as these. What perfect nonsense the whole passage becomes, if we explain "devil," "Satan," "Beelzebub," as personifications of an evil principle or disease! "If one disease or evil principle cast out another, it is divided against itself; how shall then its kingdom stand?" &c. &c.—"And when he was come out of the ship, there met him out of the tombs a man with an unclean spirit \* \* \* But when he saw Jesus afar off, he ran and worshipped him, and cried with a loud voice, and said, What have I to do with thee Jesus, thou son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not. For he said unto him, Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit. And he asked him, What is thy name? And he answered, saying, My name is Legion; for we are many \* \* \* And the unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine; and the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea (they were about two thousand) and were choked in the sea," Mark v. 2—13. What *can* all this mean? This raving madman recognizes Jesus a long way off, knows him to be the Son of God, and, on his ordering the disease to leave him, begs Jesus not to torment him! He next says his name is Legion, "for we are many;" and then (with the greatest consideration for his friends and neighbours) entreats, that his disease may not be sent "away out of the country," but that it may be sent "into the swine." And verily the conclusion is worthy of the premises. For his request is granted; and at the same time that he is restored (probably because diseases are considered the most infectious when the patient is just recovering) a neighbouring herd of swine are suddenly seized with the same kind of madness, and rush over a precipice into the sea.—"And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us? I know thee who thou art; the Holy One of God. And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not." Luke iv. 33—35. How very strange, that these madmen should almost always know Jesus, acknowledge him to be the Christ, shew signs of terror at the sight of him, and speak of themselves in the plural number as "we" and "us." Observe too, that Jesus says "*Hold thy peace, and come out of him;*" so that, although the man's lips might be the organs of speech on the occasion, yet the real speaker was *that which was to come out of him*. If it was *the disease*, which was to come out, then it was the disease, which was to

hold its peace ; if it was *the diseased man*, which was to hold his peace, then it was the diseased man, which was to come out of himself!

Many instances might also be brought, from the inspired narratives, of the Apostles, according to their Master's promise, casting out devils: but the above will amply suffice to establish the fact of literal demoniacal possession. I do not pretend to answer all the questions that may be asked about it; it is enough for me, that it is a plain revelation of God's word; and therefore there is no more excuse for disbelieving it, than there is for disbelieving that "in the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

The next circumstance, which naturally presents itself to one's mind, is our Lord's temptation by the Devil, Matt. iv. 1—11. Had *he* any evil principle within to tempt him? No; he was "holy, harmless, undefiled," and "without sin;" he had no fallen nature, no wicked heart, no carnal mind, to fight against: temptation could only come to him from without. All attempts to explain away this transaction, whether by pretending that it was a mere vision, or otherwise, totally fail. If one of the parties concerned in it was a real person, undoubtedly the other was too.

No less plain are the following testimonies to the real personality of Satan. "I beheld Satan, as lightning, fall from heaven." Luke x. 18.—"Simon, Simon, Satan *hath desired* to have you, that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not." Luke xxii. 31.—"Fire prepared for the devil and his angels." Matt xxv. 41.—"That through death he might destroy him, that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Heb. ii. 14.—"Your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about seeking whom he may devour." 1 Pet. v. 8.—Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation; but said, The Lord rebuke thee." Jude 9.—"Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." John viii. 44.—"The devils also believe, and tremble." James ii. 19.—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." 2 Pet. ii. 4.—"And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he hath reserved unto everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day. Jude 6.—"He that soweth the good seed is the Son of Man: the field is the world: the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the

wicked one: the enemy that sowed them is the devil: the harvest is the end of the world: and the reapers are the angels." Matt. xiii. 37—39. Remember, this is not a parable, but our Lord's *explanation* of a parable. This remark also applies to Luke viii. 12., "The seed is the word of God: those by the way side are those that hear: then cometh the devil, and taketh away the word out of their hearts, lest they should believe and be saved."—"Neither give place to the devil." Eph. iv. 27.—"That ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." Eph. vi. 11.—"Lest being lifted up with pride he fall into the condemnation of the devil." 1 Tim. iii. 6.—"And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will." 2 Tim. ii. 26.—"Resist the devil, and he will flee from you." James iv. 7.—"For this cause the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." 1 John iii. 8.—"God shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly." Rom. xvi. 20.—"Lest Satan should get an advantage of us; for we are not ignorant of his devices." 2 Cor. ii. 11.—"*For Satan himself* is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." 2 Cor. xi. 14.—"Wherefore we would have come unto you, even I Paul, once and again; but Satan hindered us." 1 Thes. ii. 18.

Let me conclude, by drawing your attention to two important passages, in which the practical application of this subject is briefly summed up. "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness [the original is "*wicked spirits*"] in high places." Eph. vi. 12. This is explained to mean the Jewish ecclesiastical rulers. But St. Paul says, "*We wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against wicked spirits.*" By which he means, that the Jews, or any other human adversaries, were only tools of Satan; and that whether the assault came from within or without, *he* was the great enemy, which the Christian had to contend with. What force this gives to that petition in the Lord's prayer, which is the last passage I shall notice, "*Deliver us from the evil one,*" as it is in the original. How much more keenly should we feel the need of this request, and how much more earnestly should we make it, if in all our conflicts either with inward corruption or with outward foes, we kept constantly in mind, that we "*wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against wicked spirits in high places,*" under the command of that great Leader, "*the Prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience.*" Eph. ii. 2.

## LECTURE XVI.

### THE SABBATH.

"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isaiah lviii. 13, 14.

THE main ground on which the obligation of the Sabbath is sought to be denied, is, that it was merely a Jewish ordinance, and therefore, like all the other rites and ceremonies of Judaism, done away with by Christ.

The following illustration may show the force of such an objection, more clearly perhaps, than laboured argument. A number of persons form themselves into a society for certain purposes. They have various rules and regulations for their members, with particular penalties attached to the breaking of them. One law is, that any member convicted of drunkenness, shall receive a certain number of lashes, after the manner of the army or navy. Well; the society lasts for a time, and is then broken up. After its dissolution, one of its former members is summoned before a magistrate for drunkenness. What is his defence? Why, he pleads that there is no law against it now; that the society being dissolved, its rules are no longer binding. Certainly not, says the magistrate; but *the law of the land* is binding. There was a law against drunkenness long before your society existed, and *that* law is as much in force as ever; the repealing of your bye-laws cannot do away with the old established law of the land. Then do you mean to have me flogged?—asks the culprit. By no means: is the reply: I'm not going to inflict on you the particular penalty enjoined by the law of your former society, but the general penalty, which is enjoined by the law of the land: you are no longer liable to the one, but as much as ever to the other.

Now this is just the state of the case with regard to the law of the Sabbath. It was originally the universal law of the land. It was given to Adam in Paradise as the father of the whole human race. Adam was no more a Jew than he was an

Englishman; and the command given to him is as much binding upon every nation in every age of the world, as it was upon any Jew that ever lived. When the Jewish national law was given to them by Moses in the wilderness, there were certain particular *penalties* attached to the breaking of the Sabbath, which are now of course no longer in force; because that *ceremonial* and *judicial* law is repealed. But the repealing of those bye-laws, if we may so call them, which were only fitted for the temporary circumstances of the Jewish nation, cannot affect the original universal law of the world: that remains in force as much as ever. Yet persons can be found, who will actually reply to any argument in favour of keeping the Sabbath, "Oh! then you would stone a man for gathering sticks on Sunday." Let me ask them whether they consider the *fifth* commandment repealed, as well as the fourth: whether they think we are "*eased*" from the obligation to honour our parents. If they say, No; I would answer them in their own coin, "Oh, then you would stone a child for disobeying his father or mother:" for this was the penalty under the Mosaic law. Or again, Do you think Christians "*relieved*" from the prohibition of the *seventh* commandment against adultery? If not, may we further ask, Would you stone a woman, who was found guilty of it? Surely we need say no more to expose the fallacy of such objections.

But in order to escape from this, some learned men have been bold enough to deny that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise, and to contend that it was first given to the Israelites at Mount Sinai. \* "This preposterous notion Dr. Wardlaw refutes with the clearness and force for which his writings are remarkable. The plain language of the passage (Gen. ii. 1—3) disproves it. It is the language of *history*, and relates to the appointment of the day of rest as made *at the time*, with the same simplicity as that with which all the other associated transactions of creation are related. The nature of things shows that the reference could not be to any future event. If it is admitted that the Sabbath was a *commemoration of God's work of creation*, then why should not the commemoration commence from the time the work to be commemorated was completed? Was it not thus with the Passover? Was it not thus with the Lord's Supper? And why not with the Sabbath?"

\* This quotation, and several that follow, are taken from a review in the "Christian Penny Record" of four admirable tracts, that deserve wide circulation:—"The Divine Authority and Permanent Obligation of the Sabbath," by the Rev. Dr. Wardlaw; "Traces of the Primitive Sabbath in many of the Institutions of the Ancient World," by the Rev. J. Jordan; "The Sabbath not a mere Judaical Appointment," by the Rev. A. Thompson; "The Adaptation of the Sabbath to the Temporal Well-Being of Men, and more especially of the Working Classes," by the Rev. D. King. Partridge, London.



As the Sabbath was made for man, it is natural to infer that it was coeval with the race for whose benefit it was intended.

'It will not surely be questioned,' he says, 'that the words—'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy,' (Exodus xx. 8)—are words which pre-suppose its existence. Now we have seen that the terms of the former passage—'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord,'—are terms which, on no natural principle, can be explained as the first enactment of the Sabbatic rest; but that they assume its pre-existence as well as those before us. To what previous period of institution, then, can the fourth commandment refer? What other is there, or can there be, but the period of the creation? And 'the reason annexed' to this commandment, accordingly, carries us back at once to that time and to that event:—"For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the Sabbath day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. This should be enough: but it is not all. It is clear as day, that in the terms of this 'reason annexed' there is reference to *the terms of the history*. The one are a quotation of the other. Moses had himself, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, recorded the early fact: and while, in the words of the commandment—'Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy'—he assumes its pre-existence; by citing the terms in which he had himself recorded its origin, he shows at once its high antiquity, and its primary design. The words in Genesis may be justly called '*the words of institution*.' They are there, and there alone. There are no such words of institution in Exodus xvi.: and in Exodus xx. they are *not* words of institution; for even the miracle of the manna, when the Sabbath is by our opponents supposed to have commenced, preceded the giving of the law; they are only a *quotation* of the words of institution. So that, unless the Sabbath was instituted at the time when these words were used, *there is no formal institution of it anywhere to be found*.'

"It is objected, however, that there is little or no notice of the Sabbath in the inspired account of the antediluvian and patriarchal ages. Dr. Wardlaw disposes of this objection in the following conclusive manner:—

'First, Throughout the entire preceding history, we find *weeks* a recognised division of time, 'corresponding, of course, to the creation week, from which the division had its origin, and which consisted of *six days of work and one of rest*, so that every mention of weeks includes the mention of the Sabbath; and Secondly, from the fact of there being no mention of the Sabbath in the subsequent historical books of Scripture (those of Joshua and Judges), for a period of at least four hundred years after its admitted institution in the wilderness; and of

the extremely rare and incidental notice of it for even a greater number of centuries posterior to the close of the Book of Judges; and from the further parallel facts of their being no mention, for a period of 1500 years—from the birth of Seth to the flood—of *sacrifice*; and for a similar period of 1500 years—from the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan till the birth of Christ—of *circumcision* as an existing rite, unless in an occasional and figurative use of the word by the historians and prophets. In none of the cases is such silence conclusive; and in the case of the Sabbath, the objection from the silence before is completely neutralised by the silence after.

‘But is not God said to have *‘made known* to Israel his holy Sabbath?’ Nehemiah ix. 14. Yes, we reply; but does it follow from this that the Sabbath was unknown and unobserved before? Without insisting on the phrase *‘making known*’ rather implying the existence already of the thing made known, than expressing its commencement, we may reply, So is God said to have *‘made known* his ways to Moses, and his *acts* unto the children of Israel!’ from which, surely, it does not follow that none of them had ever been *‘made known*’ before; far less, that they did not exist before! The Sabbath, too, it is alleged, is said to have been *‘given*’ to Israel. Ezek. xx. 10—12. ‘What else,’ it has been said, can this mean than its being *first instituted* in the wilderness?’ The answer is, First, that the same word is, in the same passage, as well as in Nehem. ix., applied to God’s *statutes*, and *judgments*, and *precepts*, and *laws generally*, as well as to his Sabbaths. Is it to be inferred from this, that there were no divine laws *‘given*’ to men prior to the time of the Exodus? Not so thought and taught the Apostle Paul. He argues with the Jews, that there was a law anterior to theirs, binding on *mankind*, Jews and Gentiles alike, from the simple fact that *‘death*,’ the penalty of sin, *‘reigned*’ over all men *‘from Adam to Moses*;’ the penalty of sin implying the existence of sin, and the existence of sin the existence of a law; seeing *‘sin is not imputed where there is no law*.’ Rom. v. 13, 14. And Secondly, that by our Lord himself the word *‘given*’ is expressly used respecting another rite, when it does not mean, and by himself is explained as not meaning, *original institution*. John vii. 27. ‘Moses, therefore, *gave* unto you circumcision (not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers);’ its having been *given* by Moses, then, does not signify its having been *“first instituted”* by Moses. Previously existing institutes and laws might, with all truth, be represented as *‘made known*,’ and as *‘given*,’ to a particular people, when, in a systematic and embodied form, with special solemnity, and with peculiar sanctions, they were delivered from heaven to that people; and when the possession of them in that form became the distinction

of that people from others. And on this ground, too, we find a satisfactory answer to another objection, namely, that the Sabbath, in different passages, is spoken of as given to be '*a sign* between Jehovah and the people of Israel;' which, it is alleged, implies its having been, and having been designed to be, peculiar to that people. Now, the same thing is true of the whole law, not the ceremonial code merely.'"

" 'When an important institution is for the first time introduced, we expect it to be done formally. We expect the reasons of its appointment to be specified, the themes which it was to commemorate detailed, and the modes of its observance minutely prescribed. This is done in the institution of the Passover, as described in the twentieth chapter of the same book. But the whole history of the transaction in the wilderness of Sin, suggests the idea of an institution already known, and the liberty of observing which is now perfectly restored. The passage, Exodus xvi. 22—30, is too long for quotation; but supposing the candid enquirer to turn to it in his Bible, we ask him to notice and duly consider the following remarks. In the first place, the people gather, *of their own accord*, twice as much bread, two omers for one man, on the sixth day—a fact which it is difficult to account for on any other supposition than that they anticipated and prepared for the rest of the seventh day. In the second place, Moses mentions the Sabbath only *incidentally*, in answer to a question put to him by the rulers. They approach him, and inquire whether the people had done right in gathering a double quantity of manna on the sixth day; and it is this question which leads him to notice the Sabbath. 'And he said unto them, This is that which the Lord hath said.' What had the Lord said, and to whom had he said it? The fourth and fifth verses of the chapter inform us, 'Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you. \* \* \* And it shall come to pass, that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily.' The meaning of his words to the rulers then is, 'The people have done quite right; their conduct is in accordance with what the Lord said to me, that they are to gather a double quantity on the sixth day, and that they are also to prepare what they bring in.' And then he adds, 'To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord; bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe, and that which remaineth over, lay up for you to be kept until the morning.' In the third place, Moses does not speak in the style of one promulgating a new law; nor do we find him giving any instructions whatever as to the manner in which it is to be kept. Indeed, it does not appear that he would, but for the question of the rulers, have adverted to the Sabbath at all on this occasion;

and when he does advert to it, it is simply to intimate, that because it was a season of holy rest, no manna would fall on that day, and that they were not to seek for it. He does not say to the rulers, 'The Lord has commanded that to-morrow, and every succeeding seventh day, *shall be kept* holy to the Lord;' but, 'To-morrow *is* the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord, and this is the reason why a double quantity of manna has fallen on the sixth day. Six days ye shall gather it, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.' And when some went out on the Sabbath seeking for manna, he reproved them, saying, 'See, for that the Lord hath *given you back the Sabbath*; therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.' Had the Sabbath now been enjoined for the first time, can we doubt that Moses would have done as we find him doing on all similar occasions—delivered it to the people in the name of the Lord, saying, 'Thus and thus shall ye keep it.' But when we consider that the people gathered spontaneously a double quantity on the sixth day, that Moses notices the Sabbath only incidentally, in reply to the questions of the rulers, that he gives no explanation of its nature, or directions as to its observance; and all that he says regarding it refers to the fact that on that day no manna was to fall, and that the people were not to go out from the camp to search for it; we feel ourselves closed up by all these considerations to the conclusion, that the wilderness of Sin was not the birth place of this benign institute, but that the scenes transacted there evidently point back to an earlier and primeval appointment.'

"If the language in Genesis be not the record of a transaction taking place at the time specified, it may be pertinently asked—

" 'Why may not a similar conjecture be entertained regarding any other transaction recorded as having taken place at the creation, and thus the whole authority and certainty of inspired history be unsettled and undermined? A plain and honest reader, on hearing such an interpretation suggested to him, is tempted to say, 'Well, if I cannot understand so plain a narrative as this, I am compelled to distrust my own judgment in seeking the meaning of the simplest statement of Scripture, and must hand over the interpretation of the Bible entirely to the learned.'

No—the Sabbath remains:—

'Time writes no wrinkles on its hallowed brow,  
Such as creation's dawn beheld, we see it now.'

A strong confirmation of what Scripture teaches us concerning the first institution of the Sabbath, is the fact that

in every country of the globe, and from the remotest antiquity, the division of time into *weeks of seven days* has been almost universally observed. Abundant proof of this is given in Mr. Jordan's tract, noticed in a previous note. What makes this so striking is, that a *week* is no *natural* division. It would be nothing marvellous to find every nation observing the same *year*, with its four *seasons*; because that is naturally marked out by the time which the earth takes to go round the sun. Neither should we be surprised to find them observing the same *months* and *days*; because the former is marked by the revolution of the moon, and the latter by the revolution of the earth round its own axis. But no possible reason can be given why a further division of time should be made into *seven* rather than into *six*, *eight*, or *nine* days. This, therefore, could only have arisen from some *positive institution*; which institution, from the universality of the practice, must have been much earlier than the time of Moses. Certainly, nothing later than Noah will adequately account for it: and we should be glad if those who reject the account of its institution given in the book of Genesis, would attempt to favour us with a more rational and probable theory.

But though it is necessary to meet the enemy on his own ground, I really cannot see how the permanent obligation of the Sabbath could be denied, even supposing it had never been mentioned to man till the Israelites heard it at Mount Sinai. The question would then be. Are the ten commandments universally binding, or were they only binding upon Jews before the time of Christ? No one denies that the *ceremonial* and *judicial* laws then given are repealed; but is the *moral* law also repealed? Were the ten commandments only part of the temporary Jewish constitution, or were they the eternal and universal declaration of God's will to man, committed, together with the inspired records, to the keeping of that nation (Rom. iii. 2), for the future benefit of the whole human race?

Now I think no one can carefully study the account of the transactions at Mount Sinai, without perceiving the essential difference between the moral law and the code of ceremonial and judicial regulations given afterwards. It would be impossible to enter at all minutely into the subject; but we may just notice one or two prominent points. The moral law was uttered by the mouth of God himself, amidst a terrific display of thunder, lightning, and earthquake; and with various accompaniments calculated to inspire the people with the utmost awe. It was written on two tables of *stone* by the finger of God. When these were broken by Moses in his indignation at the sin of the people, God (as if to shew that, though Israel had broken the moral law as their national covenant, yet its precepts were permanently binding) directed him to prepare

two other tables, also of *stone*, and write on them the same commandments. On the other hand, the ceremonial and judicial law was given afterwards by the mouth of Moses, without any of the forementioned solemnities, at quite a different time and in quite a different manner; nor were they written upon tables of stone. This difference is most emphatically pointed out by Moses himself in that speech, which he delivered to the Israelites just before his death. After repeating the ten commandments, he adds, "These words spake the Lord unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: *and he added no more.*" Deut. v. 22.

But the authority of Jesus Christ is appealed to, as the introducer of a new dispensation; and from him therefore we must learn whether the ten commandments are still binding upon Christians, or whether one of them has been struck out. We cordially join in the appeal; and on turning to that favourite sermon on the mount, which is thought to demolish at a stroke the whole of the Old Testament, we find him using rather strong language on the point:—"Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, *till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled.* Whosoever, therefore, shall break *one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so*, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven: but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." Matt. v. 17—19. What those, who submit to "the teaching of Christ," can want more than this, I am at a loss to conceive: and equally so, how any man, that even calls himself a Christian, can doubt for one moment the perpetual obligation of the Sabbath.

Our Lord's judgment, however, on the question, does not end here. In Matt. xii. 1—13 we find him entering into a controversy with the Jews, not on the moral law generally, but on this particular command of it. And we have the more satisfaction in referring to this passage, because it is a good deal relied on, both by those who reject a Christian Sabbath altogether, and by those who contend that its strictness is relaxed under the Christian dispensation. Now it happens that both these ideas, instead of being supported, are flatly contradicted by our Lord's argument. He is defending himself and his disciples from the charge of Sabbath breaking, because he had healed a man with a withered arm, and they had plucked the ears of corn to eat, on that day. According to our opponents' theory, what should have been his answer to them? Why evidently, that the Sabbath was now at an end, that it had been merely a temporary Jewish ordinance, and was no

longer to be observed under the new dispensation, which he was come to introduce: or according to those who take the middle view, that it was no longer to be kept so strictly as it had been, but more liberty was for the future to be allowed. Does Jesus give the remotest hint of anything of the kind? Not a word. On the contrary, he appeals to the Old Testament itself, and to their own confession with regard to a particular case, to prove that *such* work on the Sabbath *never had been* wrong; "*wherefore*" it was not wrong now. The fact was, that the Jewish *traditions* forbade a great many things on the Sabbath, which were neither forbidden by God, nor contrary to the spirit of his command. These traditions our Lord condemns, and shews the proper way of observing it; namely, the way which the Old Testament teaches, and in which consequently the Jews *always ought to have kept it*.

The three exceptions to the strict letter of the law, "Thou shalt do no manner of work," which Jesus declares always had been, and therefore would still be, permitted, are cases of *necessity, religion, or charity*. He defends his disciples' plucking the ears of corn on the two former grounds; his own healing the withered arm on the latter ground. 1. David, in a case of necessity, at the shew bread; which was contrary to the strict letter of the law. Therefore his disciples, in an equally urgent case, might properly do what *otherwise* it would have been wrong to do on the Sabbath. 2. The priest in the temple spent a considerable time every Sabbath day in killing and dividing certain animals for sacrifices; which kind of work it would *otherwise* be wrong to do on that day: but they were "blameless," because employed in the service of God, and doing God's appointed work. So the disciples of Jesus might do whatever was necessary for their doing *him* service on that day, "*for the Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day.*"\* 3. No one ever supposed it wrong to save the life of an animal, or even to relieve it from suffering, on the Sabbath; was it a less case of mercy or charity to heal a man's withered hand? "Wherefore it is lawful to do well on the Sabbath days."

Now let me ask any candid man, whether he thinks it possible, that Jews could have meant to do away with the obligation of the Sabbath. How perfectly absurd for him to be at all this pains to show what particular kinds of work might be done on

\* It may increase the certainty of the conclusion, that Jesus here asserts his Godhead (without which, indeed, his argument falls to the ground), to remember that on another occasion he answers their charge of Sabbath breaking on the same ground. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work;" that is, My Father does not suspend his works of providence and grace on the Sabbath; he does what he pleases on his own day: and so do I, for I am "Lord even of the Sabbath day." So plainly did the Jews understand this, that they "sought the more to kill him because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." John v. 17, 18.

the Sabbath-day, if from that time forth *any thing* might be done on it! "Is this like the course of defence that our Lord would have adopted, had the Sabbath been on the eve of its decay? But is it not the very mode of defence which we should have expected him to adopt, had his design been to relieve it from the rubbish of pharisaism, and to present it in its primeval and untarnished beauty? Suppose you saw a man taking pains to restore a defaced inscription on a pillar, to remove from it the rubbish that had been heaped around its base, and to tear away the ivy that surrounded its summit, would you not infer that it was his intention, that the pillar with its inscription should remain for the information of after ages? Such was now the conduct of our Lord in reference to the Sabbath-law. And it is very much to the point to remark, that a case cannot be produced from the whole evangelical history, in which he took similar pains with the explanation of a mere ceremonial appointment. 'Our Lord,' says a profound and accurate thinker, 'corrected those errors alone which had disfigured the pure maxims of the law of universal obligation; we find no corrections made by him of temporary or national ordinances.'"

And I would further ask those who contend for a "moderate" observance of the Sabbath now, Where is your authority in these, or any other words which Christ ever uttered, for supposing that its original strictness has been one iota relaxed? Did he ever give a hint that anything would for the future be allowed, which had not always been allowed, on that day—not by the Jewish rabbis, mind, but—*by God*? Did he ever hint, that God would no longer approve of, and bless, *such* an observance of the Sabbath as is commanded in our text? Or that he would no longer look upon Sabbath breaking with such displeasure, as it is evident he used to look upon it, by his ordering Moses to inflict the punishment of *death* on the offender? That the *literal* promise to obedience, and the *literal* punishment for disobedience, were peculiar to the Jews, and not applicable to Christians, is readily admitted. But that has nothing to do with the *duty* enjoined, as we have already shewn. Is the duty to obey our parents less binding, or does God look upon disobedience to them with less displeasure now, than when he ordered the Jewish child who was obstinately guilty of it to be stoned to death? Certainly not. And the case is precisely the same with the Sabbath. The nature, character, and spirit of the day remain just what they ever were; and just as surely as ever will a blessing follow the observance, and a curse the violation, of it.

Our Lord's direction to his disciples about their flight from Jerusalem, which did not take place for many years after the descent of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, also bears



upon this question. "And pray ye that your flight be not in the winter, *neither on the Sabbath day.*" Matt. xxiv. 20. Why not? Because, if it happened in very inclement weather, the hardships of their sudden flight would be greatly increased; and if it happened on the Sabbath, they would lose their day of rest. Can any plainer proof be required, that Jesus intended his people *always to enjoy a Sabbath?*

But we must not forget the favourite text, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." Nor, indeed, would we willingly lose its valuable aid. A more suicidal argument it would scarcely have been possible for our opponents to bring. May we ask them, with all respect, whether an Englishman of the 19th century is *not* a "*man?*" "The Sabbath was made for MAN;"\* *therefore* it was a *temporary Jewish* institution!! It may perhaps be replied, that the text is not brought forward to disprove its universal obligation, but to shew that its strictness is relaxed under the present dispensation. But how does it shew anything of the kind? Does it say that the Jewish man, or mankind hitherto, *had* been made for the Sabbath, but that for the future the Sabbath would be made for them? Does it imply any *change* whatever? Not in the least. Christ announces in these words a general truth, but nothing new: he tells them what always had been, and always would be, the case—that "the Sabbath *was* made for man, and not man for the Sabbath." And what does Christ mean to teach by this truth? That the spiritual observance of it, which God commands by the mouth of Isaiah, "Not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words," is too strict for man? Impossible! for "The Sabbath was made for man" *then* just as much as it is *now*: so that if it is too strict now, it was too strict then; and God would never have commanded it, or promised his blessing to it. What our Lord did mean to teach by the saying in question was, that the rules and regulations imposed upon the Jews *by their traditions* were foolish, useless, mischievous, and contrary to the spirit of the ordinance, *as it was given by God.* The Sabbath was made for man's temporal and spiritual benefit; and therefore was to be observed in such a manner, and in such a manner only, as would most conduce to his highest interests. What that manner was, had already been shewn most clearly by the prophet Isaiah—"If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own

\* It may be well to remind the unlearned reader, that the Greek word here translated "man" means mankind in general, without any reference to sex: just as, indeed, we frequently use the word "man" ourselves—for instance, in the text.

pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Isaiah lviii. 13, 14. And as the *object* of the Sabbath remained the same from the beginning to the end of time, it having been "*made for man*" without respect of time or place, its spirit and principles were unchangeable.

The nickname of Judaisers however being so commonly given to those, who "remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy"—yes, even by persons, who every Sunday, on hearing their Maker's command, dare to mock him by saying, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law"—it may be useful to expose still further the fallacy of this charge. And it would be impossible to do it more ably, than by giving the following article from the Witness.

#### THE JUDAICAL AND THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH.

Nothing is more common than to hear the term "Judaical" applied, by way of contempt, to everything like a religious observance of the Sabbath. If we object to a "pleasure trip," or "a snug dinner party," on Sunday; if we raise our voices against the "innocent relaxation" of Sunday balls or Sunday railways, or express fears that the customs of the Continent may soon be transplanted into Presbyterian Scotland;—"O," it is said, "you are for a Judaical observance of the Sabbath!" and the term is understood to convey the idea of all that is bigoted in sentiment, sombre in aspect, and austere in demeanour. Never, however, was there a more gross application of the term. That the Jews were scrupulous, to a ridiculous excess, in the suspension of manual labour on that day, and carried this beyond both the letter and spirit of their own law, is perfectly true. But so far were they from converting the day thus rescued from weekly toil into a season of gloom and asceticism, that, in point of fact, they devoted it more than any other day to carnal ease and indulgence. It may appear strange to some, but it is perfectly well known to all acquainted with Jewish antiquities, that, in accordance with the rules laid down by the Jewish rabbis, the Sabbath was celebrated as a holiday of joviality and good cheer. Interpreting literally the words of the prophet, "Thou shalt call the Sabbath a delight," or day of delights; and applying to the Sabbath the law of the feast of tabernacles, "Thou shalt rejoice in thy feast," they conceived that they honoured the Sabbath by abandoning themselves to all sorts of voluptuous enjoyment. The Sabbathine rules enjoined the sons of Abraham to prepare for the feast by purchasing the materials the

day before; flesh, fish, and generous wines were to be laid in; and the costlier the provision, the more honour was done to the Sabbath. On that morning they were allowed to repose in bed longer than usual. On rising, they were to dress themselves in their holiday attire; and, after finishing the services of the synagogue, to prepare themselves for social enjoyment at the well covered table. Forgetting all their worldly losses, cares, and sorrows, and avoiding all sadness of countenance, they were literally "to be glad and make merry;" the festival cup was to go round merrily, though moderately, for excess would only spoil enjoyment; and conversation was to turn only on topics of a light and pleasant character. It was only in keeping with this, that marriages were frequently celebrated on the Sabbath, and that on these occasions they were allowed to recreate their spirits with music and dancing. Such was the "Judaical" observance of the Sabbath, early introduced, and continued in some places till this day. And yet there are some sapient gentlemen who would apply the phrase to designate the highest pitch of melancholy and moroseness. And we have some recollection, that when an advocate of the Sabbath, at a meeting of railway proprietors, disclaimed a Judaical observance, the announcement was received with ironical cheers!

"There must be always some foundation for popular blunders, and it is not difficult to discover the origin of that to which we now refer. The Jews, about the time of our Saviour, were distinguished by a *superstitious* observance of the Sabbath. Superstition is a little-minded thing, and minds little things. The Jews were much more scrupulous in paring their nails on the Sabbath, going over their fingers according to a certain prescribed order, and throwing the parings into the fire, than in attending to the substantial duties of that hallowed day. Superstition looks to the letter of the law, and neglects its spirit. The Jews, in their zealous regard to the letter of the Sabbath law, added many traditions of their own. God had commanded them to bake and seethe the manna on the day preceding the Sabbath,—a temporary command, and founded on the reason assigned, that on that holy day no manna was to fall. The Jews, extending this rule to all times, improved upon it by prohibiting all sorts of cooking on the Sabbath. The law had said, "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitation on the Sabbath day," meaning evidently, as appears from the connexion, fires for "doing work therein;" and this they applied to the kindling of all fires, even for necessary purposes. The law had said they were to carry no burden on the Sabbath; and this prohibition they extended to the carrying of a stick in their hands, or a

piece of money in their pockets. This extreme rigidity in regard to small things—this tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, while they forgot the weightier matters of the law—was severely and justly rebuked by our Lord. And our modern desecrators of the Sabbath would identify this wretched paltriness of Jewish superstition with the true spiritual sanctification of the Lord's day.

“Nothing can be more opposite in reality than the Judaical observance of the Sabbath condemned by our Lord, and the Christian observance of it which he has enjoined. But let it be remembered, they differ, not as austerity differs from gaiety; not as asceticism differs from carnal indulgence; but as superstition differs from genuine piety, and as the flesh differs from the spirit. The one consisted in meats, and drinks, and divers washings; the other lies in righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. The time has come when men must worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Christianity is fully as much opposed to Judaical levities, as it is to Judaical littleness, on the Sabbath day. The Christian is commanded to “call the Sabbath of the Lord a delight;” but to him it is a day of spiritual, not of carnal delights. If he abstains from manual labour on that holy day, it is not for the refreshment of the body merely; that is a subordinate object; but for the refreshment of the immortal spirit. It is “a *holy resting* all that day, even from such worldly employments and recreations as are lawful on other days.” It implies an abstinence from all worldly work; but only that the time thus redeemed from the day be “spent in the public and private exercises of God's worship.” In short, Christianity frees us from the bondage of the world on this day, that it may be converted into “an holy Sabbath unto the Lord.” It places the institute of the Sabbath on its original basis, and restores it to its primitive design, to serve as a memorial of Divine rest, and as a type and token of the rest of heaven.

“This spiritual character, which Christianity stamps on the Sabbath, as it does on prayer, the sacraments, and all the institutions of Divine worship, is clearly opposed to sensual gratification of every sort; and may account for the fact, which may otherwise appear anomalous, that social pleasures, and even the beauties of external nature, so conducive on other days to healthful and innocent enjoyment, are found to interfere with the proper duties of that sacred day. It is not that there is anything sinful in these pleasures, far less “in looking through nature up to nature's God;” but that we are substituting these in place of the appointed means of grace, and in so far defeating the spiritual design of the Sabbatical rest. It is not that God can be displeased with our contemplating

his own works; but that, when the Great King invites us to meet him in his palace, it is no excuse for failing to obey the summons, to tell him that we have been sauntering in the neighbouring preserves. It is not that there is any incompatibility between nature and religion: but that we are so much the creatures of habit, as to be unable, without some effort of abstraction from the world around us, to hold converse, for any length of time, or to any good purpose, with the realities of an unseen eternity. Do our best, the world will enter at every pore, and rush in, unbidden, at every avenue of the heart. It requires a constant straining to make head against it; and as the devout worshipper feels constrained, when engaged in prayer to his God, to close his eyes on the external world, that, undisturbed by its solicitations, he may worship Him who is a spirit in spirit and in truth, it seems necessary for the real enjoyment, as well as for the due observance, of the Lord's day, that, as far as possible, at *every* entrance, the world be "quite shut out."

"It is this very feature of the Christian Sabbath, however, which renders it so peculiarly offensive to the natural man. Allow him to "do his own pleasure" on God's holy day, and he will submit, like the Jews of old, to any small penances, any artistic devotions, you may choose to prescribe. He will count his beads or kiss his crucifix as often as you please, if, by so doing, he may purchase a license to spend the rest of the day in the haunts of pleasure, where he may forget that there is a God to be worshipped, a Heaven to be won, or a soul to be saved. But the true *spiritual* sanctification of the Lord's day is what his heart recoils from. It is not the suspension of week-day labour that he dislikes, but the spiritual exercises which are substituted in its room. It is not the Judaical, but the Christian Sabbath, that proves his rock of offence. It follows from this that the outward observance of the Lord's-day may be regarded as the best criterion of the spiritual condition of the mass, as well as of the individual. As by the force of custom in Christian countries, ordinary business is generally suspended on that day, we may judge pretty correctly of the religious character of the people by the employments which occupy its place. If the day that is gotten from the world be given to God, we have the fairest test of piety which it is possible, perhaps, for a nation to exhibit; if it be given to self, to sensuality, and to sin, we have the surest mark of a nation's ungodliness. And hence, in the language of inspiration, the "keeping of the feet from polluting the Sabbath," is put for the whole of religion."

We now come to the stronghold of the opponents of the Sabbath, (on which subject I shall quote entirely from the periodical before mentioned,) namely,

THE CHANGE OF THE DAY FROM THE 7TH TO THE 1ST, UNDER  
THE CHRISTIAN DISPENSATION.

"As we remarked before, the exact time of the Sabbath could not be essential to any institution made for people living in different latitudes.\* Besides, "the Lord of the Sabbath" could change the time of keeping it whenever he pleased. The question is, Whether He has done so or not? We affirm that He has;—and that, reasoning *a priori*, it was natural that He would.

"At the original institution of the Sabbath (Gen. ii. 23,) one special reason was assigned for its celebration. It was designed to commemorate the glorious work of Creation; to keep mankind in mind of Him in whom we "live and move and have our being," to make known His name, and afford an opportunity for worshipping and serving Him. When the law of the Sabbath was long after newly enjoined upon the Jews—an *additional* reason was given, namely, the miraculous deliverance of the people from Egypt,—Deut. v. 12—15: "And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm: *therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day.*" That the latter reason is not a substituted but an added one, is manifest from the fact that, when the commandment was announced along with the rest by the voice of Jehovah, from Sinai, *the original reason alone is mentioned.*"

"But," adds Dr. Wardlaw, "mark the difference. The transcendent excellence and glory of the work of redemption, and the surpassing preciousness of its blessings, will not admit of its having the place of a mere *additional* reason for the keeping of the day. It must become the *chief*. It must have the first place. It must take precedence even of creation. First in the Divine estimate of greatness, it must be first in man's grateful and reverential commemoration. How, then, shall this priority be marked? How shall the superior importance of redemption be recognised and testified in the celebration? Why, in order to give it the lead, *the day shall be changed*. Creation had the day before; redemption shall have it now. Not, in either case, exclusively:—for as, from the time of the first promise, God was worshipped as *Redeemer* as well as *Creator*; so from the time of the fulfilment of the promise by the finished work of Christ, He continues to be worshipped as *Creator* as well as *Redeemer*. But, his glory

\* When you remember, that it is day in one part of the world while it is night in another; and that a person sailing round the world in one direction gains a whole day, while a person sailing round it in the other direction loses a whole day; it is clearly impossible for it to be essential to a strict obedience to God's command, that the day we keep holy should be actually the seventh day from the close of creation.

as seen 'in the face of Jesus'—in the wonders of that work of salvation 'into which Angels desire to look'—surpassing the glory as seen in the external universe,—and the benefits of man from the one so prodigiously exceeding that arising to him from the provisions of the other;—He is specially owned and adored, on the Christian Sabbath, in the character of "**THE GOD OF OUR SALVATION.**" Now, such an arrangement recommends itself to our minds as reasonable and right. From the pre-eminent place which **REDEMPTION** holds in the revelation of God,—being its grand discovery, and the pervading theme of its celebration, it is no more than we might be prepared to expect."

"After this beautiful introduction, the Doctor proceeds to state the direct Scriptural proofs usually alleged on this part of the subject. For instance, Acts xx. 6, 7, where we read that Paul abode seven days to attend public worship—and that this public worship was not on the *seventh* day of the week, but the *first*—for on that day "the disciples came together to break bread," and Paul preached to them, ready to depart on the morrow.

"That the first and not the seventh, was the *stated day* of public worship, is clear from 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, where we read that the Apostle had "given orders" to the churches of Galatia, and now repeated the orders to the Corinthians, that they should "*on the first day of the week,*" lay by their contributions towards the "collection for the saints," that there might be no no gatherings when he came.

"In Rev. i. 10, we have the first day of the week emphatically called "**THE LORD'S DAY**"—intimating to us that this was already a well-known and familiar designation.

"And what designation could be more appropriate for the day on which, after having been 'delivered for our offences,' he was 'raised again for our justification?'—the day which sealed the divine acceptance of his finished work, and was the prelude to his final and universal triumph? The day is **HIS**—sacred to him, and to the exercise of thankful commemorative adoration for the redemption effected by his death and certified by his resurrection.—And with this passage we cannot but connect those recorded appearances of his to his disciples after his rising from the dead,—in which he, in a manner, practically claimed it as his own, and set the example of its hallowed appropriation. He appeared to them in the evening of the day of his rising. He permitted Thomas to remain for a week in his incredulity, and on the next first day of the week presented himself again,—satisfied his doubts, and received his adoring homage. His first two appearances seem thus to have been designed to mark out the day as henceforth the appropriate commemorative day for the people of God,—commemora-

tive of his own work, the work of redeeming love. And after his ascension, the glorious day of the Spirit's effusion,—the blessed day of the commencement of his reign,—the pentecostal day,—was also 'the first day of the week.'—And to complete this department of our plea, it ought to be observed what a correspondence there is between '*the Lord's day*' as the designation of the Christian Sabbath, and '*the Sabbath of the Lord*' as one of the designations of the seventh day from the beginning, '*My Sabbath*' it was called by Jehovah. Does not the one thus stand for the other?

"Dr. Wardlaw takes a novel, and, as we think, a correct view of the passage in Hebrews,—'there remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God'—which he adduces as a positive proof of the Divine authority of the Christian Sabbath. We have not space for his preliminary observations, but as his interpretation differs from that which has been almost universally received, (owing to a custom too common with our translators, of rendering different Greek, or Hebrew words, by the same English word, and *vice versa*,) we shall give his reasoning at some length. To us it appears conclusive; but to feel its force, the reader must divest himself of all prepossessions in behalf of the common interpretation, which has all the force of habit, and all the influence of pious and delightful associations, on its side.

"1. The beautiful and striking analogy between the reason assigned for this new Sabbatic day, and that originally assigned for the old:—'There remaineth, therefore, a Sabbatism to the people of God: FOR he that has entered into his rest he also HATH CEASED FROM HIS OWN WORKS, AS GOD DID FROM HIS.'—Just suppose CHRIST to be meant by '*He that is entered into his rest*;' and the analogy is perfect and forcible. The very reading of the words renders the conclusion so simple as to be irresistible. As when God ceased from his work of creation, the day of his resting was hallowed as a Sabbatism, or a day of commemorative rest and religious celebration; so, when Jesus finished *his* work—the work of redemption, and rested from it in his resurrection and his reception to the right hand of God, that blessed day was, in all time coming, to be the day of Sabbatical rest and celebration. In the ordinary interpretation, the spirit of this allusion, and of the analogy suggested by it, is entirely lost. There is not a vestige of it left. But, interpreted as above, so completely is it preserved, that the language of God in Gen. ii. 1—3, might, in the full spirit of it, be accommodated to the work of Jesus when he rose from the dead, and the consequent sanctification of the first day of the week: 'Thus the work of redemption was finished, and all its glorious ends secured. And on the first day of the week, Jesus rose from the grave, and finally rested



from the work he had done;—wherefore the ascended Lord blessed the FIRST DAY; and sanctified it.'

"2. The '*For*' in verse 10, is plainly designed as assigning a reason for what had been stated in the verse preceding. But according to the ordinary interpretation of the passage, it neither assigns a reason, nor adduces a proof, of what is there affirmed. The supposed affirmation is—"there remaineth a rest"—the heavenly rest—"for the people of God;" and what seems to be assigned as a reason, or adduced as a proof, of this is—"for he that is entered into his rest"—the believer, namely, who dies and goes to heaven—"he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Now, apart from the *unnaturalness* of any such analogy as that between the believer's ceasing from his works on earth and God's ceasing from the six days' work of creation,—and, we think we might add, the *presumption* involved in it,—we have to ask—how the believer's ceasing from his works on his entering the heavenly rest can be a reason why that rest remaineth for him,—or how it can be a proof that it does remain for him? What kind of argument is imputed to the inspired writer, when he is made to say—'There remaineth, therefore, the heavenly and everlasting rest to the people of God; for the believer who enters into that rest ceaseth from his works, as God did from his? Surely, there is here neither reason nor proof. There is an unnatural and (to say the least of it) sufficiently bold analogy; and to the illative particle '*for*' there is left no meaning whatever: whereas, on the other view, the *analogy*—between God ceasing from the work of creation, and the Son of God ceasing from the work of redemption—is beautiful and striking,—and the *reason* thence arising—for a new '*Sabbatism* to the people of God'—is pertinent and satisfactory.—Then—

"3. All other considerations are in full harmony with this interpretation. The change of the word—from that signifying *rest* to that which the Hebrews could hardly fail to understand as meaning *the keeping of the Sabbath*—has been already adverted to.—So too has the reasonableness of expecting that in such an epistle—an epistle addressed to Hebrews, and for the express purpose of showing the harmony between the old state of things and the new, and reconciling their minds the more fully to the latter—some notice should be found of the transition, in the worship of the New Testament Church, from the seventh day to the first,—a notice which is nowhere in the epistle, unless here. We now add—that the view which we consider the passage as giving of the First day Sabbath is one which *accords precisely with the fact as to its real nature and design*. For what is that Sabbath? Is it not exactly what our explanation of the passage intimates,—a commemoration of the finished work of Jesus,—of his triumphantly 'ceasing

from that work, and entering into his rest? Is it not just a solemn and delightful celebration of this?—a rest of the believing soul in the completed redemption?—in Jehovah's perfect and eternal satisfaction in it,—his 'smelling a savour of rest' in the accepted sacrifice of his Son? Is it not a day of personal and social jubilee, of spiritual joy and praise, in memory of Him who was 'delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification?' And did not the Spirit, by the inspired Psalmist, anticipate the celebration of this day, when he dictated the prophecy—'The stone which the Builders rejected, the same is become the Head of the corner. This is the Lord's doing; and it is marvellous in our eyes. **THIS IS THE DAY WHICH THE LORD HATH MADE: WE WILL REJOICE AND BE GLAD IN IT?**

"There is one objection to the view given which naturally occurs to the English reader,—but which a single word or two of explanation will be sufficient to set aside. In the verse immediately subsequent to those on which we have been commenting, the Apostle adds—'Let us labour, therefore, to enter into that rest.' How—it is naturally enough asked—can believers be exhorted to labour to enter into the keeping of a Sabbath? Certainly they cannot. And were the only reference of the *rest* in verse 11th to the *Sabbatism* in verse 9th, this would be fatal to our interpretation. But it is not so. The objection proceeds on a misapprehension. The admonition to 'labour to enter into that rest' has reference, not all to the Sabbatism in the 9th verse, but to the rest in the 10th, —the rest into which 'He who has ceased from his work' has entered; a rest which his people are all destined to share with Him; and of which our Sabbaths on earth, in commemoration of his work, are at once the prelibation and the pledge. We commemorate Christ's rest, and we anticipate our own."

An extract from the pen of Mr. Thomson, will complete this part of the argument:—

"As for the two passages from the Apostolic epistles,\* which have been paraded with so much confidence, it is quite evident that they refer to the attempt of Judaizers to make the observance of the *seventh* day, as well as of the first, *binding* upon the Christian churches. The Apostle interferes, to protect their Christian liberty. They might observe the seventh day if they chose, but no man was to compel them to do it, or to condemn them if they did not. To suppose that these verses were intended by the Apostle, to declare that all days under the Christian dispensation were alike, is to suppose him to write one thing and practise another.

"The chain of evidence then for the perpetuity of the Sabbath is unbroken; no link fails; we trace it in the earliest periods of patriarchal life, and in the latest inspired memorials of

\* Rom. xiv. 5. Col. ii. 16, 17.

Apostolic times. Those foot-prints which we first beheld in Eden, we trace in Patmos, where the beloved Apostle was 'in the Spirit on the Lord's day.'

"And to have the scriptural authority for any observance certified, is with a Christian to have the matter set at rest. Cavil then becomes impiety. The first question with a Christian is, 'What is written in the law? how readeest thou?'—and it is his last question too. And so should it be with every man. Efforts are often made, however, by indirect means, to prevent the legitimate force of the scripture evidence. A prejudice is attempted to be raised against the Sabbath, by representing it to be oppressive, or it is insinuated to be unnecessary, or the opinions of a few great men placed in circumstances very much fitted to mislead, are triumphantly paraded against the almost unanimous voice of the evangelical churches."

"That Jewish habits should linger among the converts to Christianity was a thing to be expected. Hence their continuing to observe the seventh day as well as the first. But at length those habits died away without any authoritative interference. It was felt to be unmeet to rejoice on that day during which the Redeemer's body lay buried,—held in the earth by the bonds of death. This fact could only awaken mournful recollections, To rejoice on that day were like dancing round the tomb of the dearest friend. This could not be 'The Lord's day.'"

"The Lord's day must have been to them, as well as to us, the day on which he triumphantly rose from the dead, bringing life and immortality to light, and gladdening the world with the morning beams of a new creation—a moral creation, whose glory excelleth the physical. Was it not fitting that this day should be a sacred festival for ever. Should not this blissful event, which filled heaven with new raptures, and shed the light of hope on our guilty world, be kept in perpetual remembrance by the holy convocations of the people of God?"

"We have seen that there is the clearest Scriptural proof that the apostles, guided by their risen Saviour, who remained forty days on earth, instructing them in the things regarding his kingdom, kept the first day of the week holy instead of the last. And history teaches that the primitive church followed their example. The testimony of Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Pliny, and others, corroborates the conclusions fairly deduced from the written code of our religion. This supplementary evidence shows how the Divine record had been understood and acted on in this matter. In relying on this, we do not build on tradition or church authority. One of our most important witnesses is Pliny, who was not one of 'the Fathers.' There are some who maintain that we keep the Sabbath on the first day of the week without any authority but

that of the church. Those who have accompanied us in our argument will see how far this is from the truth. Not without meaning was the law of the Sabbath placed in the midst between those precepts which relate to God, and those which relate to man. It appropriately connects the two classes of duties. Abolish the Sabbath, and Jehovah will be neglected or denied; other gods will publicly take his place: or if he be remembered at all, it will be to profane his name. Abolish the Sabbath, and you instantly loosen the bond of all the duties of man towards his neighbour which the Decalogue enjoins.

"The Sabbath stands before the nations, and will stand to all posterity as a pillar, on which this twofold code is suspended to be read by all the world. Without the Sabbath morality no less than religion, would in the course of ages perish from the minds of men.

"The state of France is a melancholy instance of the danger of this abrogation. The King who lends the Jesuits his ships of war to proselyte the Polynesian Christians, transacts business in the public offices on Sunday. The Queen, who is a strict Catholic, used to go to horse races in the Camp de Mars, on Sunday. The Chamber of Peers sit on Sunday to conduct the trial of political prisoners. The French fairs always occur on Sunday. Every theatre in France is open every Sunday. The people employed by the Government work on Sunday. It is the day selected for all sorts of public amusements. We are assured by travellers that for nine-tenths of the people there is no Sabbath in France. The moral results are too notorious to be dwelt on here. Let England take warning."

Another objection made by some pious people to the observance of the Sabbath, as a matter of Divine obligation, is the alleged inconsistency of such a positive institution with the spirituality and freedom of the Christian dispensation.

Let the following be taken as an answer:—

"Is it really spirituality of mind that exults in such a freedom, and that looks upon others as wearing chains which Christianity entitles them to burst and throw off? Is there any one divine Institution more eminently fitted for the advancement of spirituality of mind, than the day of God when duly observed? So strong is the impression of this on our mind, both from the obvious nature of the thing, and from the general experience of the children of God,—an experience put upon record by many a happy and grateful heart, that it forms a powerful presumptive argument for the unlikelihood (we had almost said the impossibility) of its having, under the new economy, been set aside. A spiritual dispensation, surely, is not a dispensation under which the means of spirituality are taken away. And when we consider the spiritual constitution of the Sabbath, and its admirable adaptation to spiritual improvement, along with

the fearfully anti-spiritual tendencies of its cessation, we cannot bring ourselves to imagine that such an institution should be ranked among the worldly rites of a transitory ceremonial,—the ‘beggary elements’ of an introductory and carnal dispensation,—the burdensome observance of ‘a yoke of bondage!’ That a Christian should be solicitous to add as much more of his time for the cultivation of the principles and affections of godliness as he can redeem from the necessary engagements of this world, we can easily understand. But that such a man—a man under the real power of heart-felt evangelical piety—can listen with complacency to reasonings that would rob him of a portion of his spiritual enjoyment, and abridge the instituted means of his advancement in grace, and in “meetness for the inheritance of the saints in light,”—it is surely no very wide or unwarrantable breach of charity to doubt. A more convincing proof could not be furnished of secretly begun spiritual declension, than the manifestation of a disposition to insinuate doubts about the obligation of the Sabbath, and to do this without any apparent concern or trembling of heart at the conclusion:—nor can a clearer evidence appear in a christian church of a mere ‘name to live’ or a symptom more ominous of its approaching darkness and desolation, than the prevalence of such a spirit,—the rise and progress of a tendency to speculate about the abrogation, or even the curtailment, of the Sabbath of the Lord—**THE LORD’S DAY.**” “‘Everything ceremonial,’ it has been said, was done away when Christ arose from the dead, not one lingering shred of carnal ordinances remains, under this mature and spiritual economy.’ Admitted,—but what then? Is the Sabbath-law therefore repealed? Oh, most preposterous conclusion! The law which provides for the children of toil and sons of commerce—

‘Hackney’d in business, wearied at that oar  
Which thousands, once fast chained to, leave no more’—

opportunity of undisturbed attention to spiritual things, this day the badge of an immature economy, a burdensome rite which was against us and contrary to us, too carnal for Christianity or for Christians! Surely it is enough to put such a suggestion as this in plain language, in order to expose it. Would not the real state of the case be found to be, not that the Sabbath was too carnal for those who speak thus, but that they are not spiritual enough for the Sabbath. At least it is a significant fact, which these objectors might do well to ponder, that the most eminently spiritual Christians have ever been those, who relished the Sabbath most. ‘Oh, surely,’ was the frequent exclamation of the pious Philip Henry, at the close of a well spent Sabbath, ‘if this be not heaven, it must be the way to it.’

“These, and similar objections are easily disposed of, and yet their very existence and public reiteration prove to us, that we have reached a crisis in the cause of the Sabbath in our land. And we shall be sinfully blind to the magnitude of the interests that are imperilled, and to our own responsibility, if we do not strain every nerve to make the crisis terminate favourably. It is a thing of no secondary or transient interest that is assailed, when the weapons of an unhallowed warfare are lifted up against this institute of heaven. With our Sabbath-day, all that is most valuable to us as citizens, and most sacred to us as Christians, stands in jeopardy. Call for testimonies to its importance and benignant influence, and what a crowd of witnesses instantly compass us about. View it simply as a day of rest, and the whole medical world will arise to proclaim its beneficent tendencies. View it in its relations to the industrial wealth of kingdoms, and statistical enquiries will attest that six days of labour, followed by the weekly rest, are more productive than a system of continuous toil. View it in its bearings on the stability of commonwealths, and the greatest of modern statesmen, Edmund Burke, will tell you it is inestimable. View it as a bulwark against the inroads of infidelity, and Voltaire, who not only rejected Christianity, but vowed to crush it, will confess he despaired of effecting his object, so long as people assembled every week for religious worship. View it as affecting the prosperity of Christian churches, and all history will point to observance or neglect as the infallible index of spiritual prosperity or decay, and the churches of Great Britain, New England, and of the Waldenses, will be named as having been for years the most Sabbath-keeping and the most pure. View it as contributing to fan the flame of personal piety, and to deliver the soul from the gathering mists of earthly feeling, and Wilberforce will hasten to assure you, that it was his Sabbath-musings which raised his soul, when it was ready to cleave to the dust, and saved him from plunging into the troubled and turbid waves of party-warfare; and every man of living piety will tell you, that it accords with the instincts of his new nature, and that, if God had not given him a Sabbath, he would have prayed for one.”

## CONCLUSION.

It was my intention to have added a third supplementary lecture, on a subject closely connected with the last, namely—Public Worship. But on examining Mr. Barker's tract, I find that with the exception of some remarks on the Christian Ministry, to which our fifth lecture is a sufficient answer, and some very just censures on certain notorious abuses, he really admits in *theory* almost every thing one could wish. I was aware, that his followers differ from one another in their practice with regard to this point; but I certainly was not prepared to find him teaching, that Christians *ought* to meet together for prayer and praise; and what is much more, that they ought to meet in a place, where any unbelievers or ungodly person, that chooses, may come in to see and hear what is going on. Some of my readers may be as much surprised as myself, and may feel inclined to ask, Then what in the world does he object to in the usual mode of public worship? Why in the first place, he objects to Christians "going into a place of public resort, for the purpose of prayer or praise." Now, unless by "a place of public resort" he means the streets or roads (which, as our Church does not sanction the practice of meeting in such places for worship, we have nothing to do with) I am utterly at a loss to understand what he does mean. He may attach some peculiar meaning to the word "public;" but one would think a place, where his own kind of worship was to be performed, could not be very private. For he says, that all the Christians in one place should meet together for worship; and if so, unless they meet in the open air, which would be the most public place of all, they must meet in some *building*. This building must be set apart exclusively for the purpose, at all events during the hours of worship, or the worshippers would be subject to all sorts of interruption and annoyance. It cannot be a very small one, as it has to admit, not only the Church, but anybody else that likes to come. The time of meeting there must not be concealed, as, even supposing it to be privately arranged amongst the Christians, unbelievers could not attend, as Mr. B. says they ought to be allowed to do, unless they knew when and where the meeting was held. Now I should like to know, whether Mr. B. calls such a building as this a place of public resort; a place, where according to his own plan the Church *should*, and any one else *may*, resort. Perhaps he will

say, that Christians ought not to meet for worship in any place, where the public resort *for other purposes*. That is just the very thing we contend for—that there ought to be a building set apart for that purpose alone. We *retire* within our consecrated buildings, because they are the most *private* places, where the church can meet together for prayer and praise—which Mr. B. declares it is the church's duty to do. His objections therefore to *public* worship, to be at all consistent with his own theory, must be confined to camp-meetings, or practices of a similar kind.

Mr. Barker's second objection is to Christians *inviting* unbelievers and worldlings to *join* them in prayer or praise. Pray who does invite them? Why he tells us, that ungodly persons are often employed as clerks and singers. No doubt they are; and an abominable disgrace it is to any church where such is the case. But what has that to do with the system? Is it any argument against a system to say that some people abuse it? Mr. B. however quotes a passage from Robert Hall, to the effect that the Church of England is guilty of inviting the ungodly to join in Divine worship, inasmuch as her ministers address the whole congregation as "dearly beloved brethren," &c. Robert Hall *may* have used such an expression; but it sounds rather odd from the man who pronounced the Prayer Book to belong to "the very first class of uninspired compositions." If he ever did say so, he must have forgotten at the moment the church's 19th article:—"The visible church of Christ is a congregation of *faithful* men, in the which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly administered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." None but the "faithful," therefore, are considered as part of the "congregation" at all, although from the very fact of their presenting themselves to join the congregation in prayer and praise, the church charitably concludes that "as many as are present" are penitent believers. If any are not so, of course they are not included in the invitation, which is addressed only to "the congregation of faithful men." That only believers are invited is also evident from their being called upon to join "with pure hearts;" for it is only "faith" that "purifies the heart."

This objection, then, when examined, turns out to be very much like the first. In fact, the whole of the 48-page tract is as much ado about nothing as any one could wish to see. Nor should I have noticed it at all, but for the practical effect it is likely to have on the unstable; namely, to make them averse or indifferent to public worship. Voltaire, as you heard just now, confessed that he despaired of crushing Christianity as long as people would meet together every week for religious



worship: and Mr. Barker knows very well that he will not effect *his* objects, until he has made the people stop their ears to all the teaching of Christ's ministers. And whether this is done by giving them a disgust for God's house, or by holding up the clergy to them, which he does in his lectures on the Prayer Book,\* as almost universally a set of habitual liars, murderers, thieves, and idolaters, seems to be of very little consequence to him indeed. If any confidence can be placed in our Lord's axiom, "By their fruits ye shall know them," this man's writings must surely stamp his father's name upon his forehead, and proclaim him to all but the wilfully deceived as a special emissary of him who is emphatically called "the accuser of the brethren." Nor can I see any reason, except it be the want of the miraculous powers possessed by the Apostle, why the minister of Christ should shrink from addressing him as St. Paul addressed Elymas the sorcerer, "O full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" But "The Lord knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment, to be punished: but chiefly them that walk after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness, and despise governments. Presumptuous are they, self-willed, they are not afraid to speak evil of dignities. Whereas angels, which are greater in power and might bring not railing accusation against them before the Lord. But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not." 2 Pet. ii. 29.

Should these lectures be blessed by God to the deliverance of any who have fallen into the pit, or to the preservation of any who may have been standing on the edge of it, they will not have been written in vain. For "If any of you do err *from the truth*, and one convert him; let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death and shall hide a multitude of sins." James v. 19. That others may rise from them only hardened and embittered against the truth, is of course quite possible. "It was this very feeling, even with regard to *his* preaching, which made St. Paul exclaim, "Who is sufficient for these things?" And yet he could preface it by saying, "We are unto God a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved, *and in them that perish*: to the one we are a savour of death unto death, to the other a savour of life unto life." He had only to give his message, and leave God to make all the results work out his own glory. He well knew that, while no preaching or argument could of itself reach the unbeliever's heart, yet

\* Some extracts from this production are given in an appendix.

Divine grace was all-mighty, and the Spirit sovereign in his operations; and therefore that it was his duty "in meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves, *if God peradventure would give them repentance to the acknowledgment of the TRUTH*, and that they might recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who were led captive by him at his will."

And now I "cast my bread upon the waters," in humble dependence upon God's mercy that I "shall find it after many days,"—nay, after a very few days; "for the night is far spent, the day is at hand." All the lines of prophecy are converging to a point; and that point but a few years distant. All the foretold signs of the last days are threatening around us, and uttering an emphatic warning—Sinner repent, believer rejoice, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. The scoffer may ask, as St. Peter long ago said he would, "Where is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation." But he little thinks that he is himself one necessary sign of what he despises. For it is just at such a time as this, "in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of," nay, perhaps, "in such an hour" as even some of his disciples "think not," that "the Son of Man cometh." "For, as in the days that were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noe entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away; so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. Then shall two be in the field; the one shall be taken ('caught up to meet the Lord in the air'), and the other left" for the desolating judgments which will be poured upon apostate Christendom. For "the same day that Lot went out of Sodom it rained fire and brimstone from heaven, and destroyed them all. Even thus shall it be in the day when the Son of Man is revealed."

Reader, where will you be on that day? With Noah in the ark, or perishing with the unbelieving world? With Lot at Zoar, or in the city of destruction? Believer, remember that "there is now *no condemnation* to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Unbeliever, answer for yourself the solemn question, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation?" and "What shall the end of them be that obey not the Gospel of God?" Oh, hasten to plunge in that fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness; "fly "for refuge to the (*only*) hope set before" you; "to-day, while it is called to-day, harden not your hearts;" tarry not a moment, lest the tempest overtake you; lest the storm burst upon you ere you reach the covert, and you be compelled to utter that bitter lamentation, "The harvest is passed, the summer is ended, and we are not saved."

## APPENDIX

CONTAINING A FEW EXTRACTS FROM MR. BARKER'S LECTURES  
ON THE PRAYER BOOK.

"Low as is the standard of duty (*the ten commandments*) which they (the clergy) set up, they still fall fearfully short of it. They do in fact break every commandment of the ten"—"The priests (by which he means throughout the church of England clergy) are plunderers at all ends. They rank among the principal thieves in our land"—"Whatever the Queen or her successors may demand, this catechism requires us to do. If they should command us to turn Papists, this catechism teaches us, that it would be our duty to do so. If they should command us to take arms, and kill the Papists, or to kill the orthodox Dissenters, this catechism requires us to obey them. If they should require us to burn our Bibles, and take the Koran in its place; if they should require us to swear, to kill, to rob, or to lie, the catechism assures us, that our duty to our neighbours, as laid down in the ten commandments, would require us to obey their bidding." Numbers of them (the clergy) are ignorant, proud, covetous, self-willed; and all of them are teachers of the grossest errors, of the most palpable absurdities, of the flattest contradictions, of the darkest blasphemies, of the most horrible misrepresentations of God's character and works, that ever the world contained. All of them are hired by Government (!!!) to teach the most foolish and absurd fictions, to go through the most useless and ridiculous ceremonies, and to support whatever forms of oppression and wrong the Government who employs them may choose to exact"—"Here then we have in this small catechism, not only some of the worst forms of theological error, but some of the vilest and most mischievous principles of political tyranny and universal slavery as well. I say the doctrine taught by this part is most atrocious and infernal." "The men that can hire themselves to teach such errors I can regard in no other light, than as the greatest rebels against God, and the worst and most deadly enemies of our race"—

think that these men could assume such airs of self-importance, could look so lofty and assured, if they knew that you were searching their book and sifting their notions? Nothing of the kind. They would hang their heads like convicted impostors and deceivers. They would seek out some lonely hermitage far apart from society, or shut themselves up in solitary confinement in their own houses, and never dare to look abroad again by daylight, till they had thrown their follies and blasphemies aside."—"I wonder the priests are not ashamed of themselves. I cannot imagine how it is that they can look people in the face."—"They are all pure fictions; they are all ignorant ravings or wicked impositions"—"Here is another cluster of ungodly falsehoods."—"The priest stands like a black infernal deceiver, to pour forth his blasphemous falsehoods, \* \* \* (he) stands like a devil, to libel humanity, to throw horrible reflections upon the divine character, and to breathe a pestilential vapour over the fairest and loveliest productions of heaven."—"I say the priests must be dreadfully ignorant of what Christ taught, or else they must be the most reckless and wholesale liars, that ever dishonoured human nature, or burdened the creation of God"—"What wicked reckless wholesale lying. A greater regardlessness of truth, than is manifested in this book of common prayer, or in the priests and the people who use it, could not be found among the most profligate and unprincipled of men"—"They (the clergy) are the veriest cormorants, the most greedy and unprincipled extortioners, that ever God Almighty allowed to live"—"They are hired and employed by the government for this purpose—to endeavour to justify to the people whatever the government may do."—"They, (the government) have made it illegal to do right, and have enjoined men by law to do wrong. Yet in none of these things have the priests of the Church of England opposed them."—"They (the clergy) aided and countenanced the plunderers and corrupters of the nation in their ungodly and unnatural work."—"Iniquity has been their regular business. They have preached error and immorality." "They teach, that we should worship wealth, however wickedly gotten, and spurn poverty, however virtuous and honourable it may be."—"These men are to be regarded, therefore, as the hired perverters and corrupters of the nation; as the everlasting advocates of error, and blasphemy, and sin; as the sworn enemies of truth and righteousness, of Christ, of God, and of humanity; as the allies of thieves and murderers; "The blindness and senselessness, or the craft and villany of these men (the clergy) can go no further. We *must* either charge them with the vilest craft and the most censurable of all villanies, or be allowed to declare, that they are blinder than bats, and as senseless as stocks or stones."—"Do you

as the encouragers and supporters of all that is false, of all that is unholy, of all that is mean and servile, and cruel, unjust and tyrannical, of every thing bad in religion, of every thing unrighteous in government, of everything low and filthy and miserable in society at large."—"Not a few of these priests are drunkards. All of them are liars, except such of them as have not sense sufficient to *make* their falsehoods lies; all of them are perjured false swearing men."—"Even supposing them to *be* Christians, which is not the case."—"The priests of the Church of England are hired to mock God, and they do mock him every week. They are hired to support iniquity, and they *do* support it."—"Priests seem to have neither common sense, nor common delicacy."—"The clergy are amongst the most unprincipled of their race."—"Cursed are the men, who hire themselves to a government to preach what they know to be false—to use forms which they know to be unchristian—and thus prostitute their souls to falsehood and to lies for filthy lucre."—"It is a horrible and devilish article; it is as full of priestly rage and intolerance as it can hold."—"They are wishful that men should believe that the interests of their souls are entirely in their hands, and that God has appointed them to be the absolute masters and disposers of the souls of men."—"One part of their business is to teach children insincerity, to train them to falsehood and hypocrisy, to render them heartless and reckless formalists."—"The clergy of the Church of England are amongst the greatest infidel-makers on earth."—"The Church of England, then, is one of the chief props of infidelity."—"All those of the clergy of the Church of England who have common sense are hypocrites and false swearers."—"Why are not books and teachers, and other means of knowledge, supplied to every child of man? A curse upon priestcraft! A curse upon kingcraft! God blight and wither them eternally, and rid the earth of them for ever."—"Away, then, with your silly forms, your appointed times, your solemn places, your unnatural tones, your foolish gestures, your hypocritical ostentation, your public mummeries, your priestly impositions, and all your superstitious rant, and cant, and mockery. Away with them all." And what shall be put in their place? The fruits of the spirit? What a perfect heaven of "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance," must be the breast of the man who wrote the above; and who *habitually* writes and speaks thus! "Can a fountain send forth at the same place sweet water and bitter?" No: but to one without spiritual discernment, it may appear to do so; "for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light; therefore, it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness." 2 Cor. xi. 14.

These remarkable words of an inspired Apostle may perhaps remove the difficulty felt by some with regard to the virtuous lives of many unbelievers; especially in connexion with the saying, "By their fruits ye shall know them." It must also be remembered, that, instead of testing a man's doctrine by the rest of his conduct, which is the common notion, his doctrine is *one essential part of that very conduct by which he is to be tested*. This is plainly told us by St. Paul in the 8th chapter of his Epistle to the Galatians. He there gives a list of "the works of the flesh," which he says "*are manifest*," and which they who do "shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Now amongst these we find "*heresies*" or false doctrines. So that according to him, a man's belief, or *opinion* as some call it, about the way of salvation is no uncertain doubtful thing, which has to be tried by his other works; but is itself one of those "works," which "*manifestly*" shew whether he is carnally or spiritually minded.\* This however can only be manifest to an enlightened believer; because none but he can be confidently assured of the truth. "He that is spiritual judgeth all things." "Ye have an Unction from the Holy one, and ye *know* all things. I have not written unto you, because ye know not the truth, but because ye *know* it, and that *no lie* is of the truth." 1 John ii. 20.

\* "There must be also *heresies* among you" writes the same Apostle, "that they which are approved may be made *manifest*."









